

Moderation in Fashion :

OR, AN

A N S W E R

TO A

T R E A T I S E,

Written by Mr. *Francis Tallents*,

ENTITULED,

A short History of Schism, &c.

WHEREIN

His Scandalous A B U S E of the *Primitive Fathers*, and all *Ecclesiastical Antiquity*, is plainly Detected and Refuted: And the C A S E of the *present Schism*, and of *Occasional Conformity*, is fairly Stated, and clearly Resolved.

By S. G. a PRESBYTER of the
CHURCH of ENGLAND.

L O N D O N :

Printed by *W. B.* for *G. Sawbridge* at the *Three Flower-de-Luce's* in *Little-Britain*, 1705.



THE PREFACE

SEEING Man was made to serve his Creator, *Religion*, which is the Worship and Service of GOD, ought to be the great business of his Life, and to direct, guide, and sway all his Actions whatsoever, so that nothing be done repugnant or dishonourable to it. But then *Religion* being not what every working Brain shall devise, but what God doth require, we are bound to serve him according to his *known Will*, not our *fantastick Imaginations*. For otherwise we do not *obey* him, but *impose* upon him; and are not his *Servants*, but what in us lies make him *subservient* to us, and at our *command* and *disposal*; which is such an *Affront* and *Indignity* to the *Majesty* of *Heaven*, as is not to be *endured*, and will not escape *unpunished*. It is therefore every Man's great Concern

The PREFACE.

to search out and understand what is the *true Religion*, and that not only in respect of *God*, that he may worship Him in a way acceptable to his *Will*; but in respect of *himself*, because thereon depends all the *true Comforts* of his *Life* here, and *eternal Happiness* hereafter.

But if *Religion* be so much the Concern of every *single Man*, certainly it ought to be much more the Care of *Governors*, especially the *Supreme*. For the *Safety* and *Well-doing* both of *themselves* and *others*, of *Governors* and *Governed*, of *Rulers* and *People*, doth or ought to oblige them to a more than common Care in this matter. And tho' the *Strength* and *Security* of any *Government* consists chiefly in the *Unanimity*, *Agreement*, and *Obedience* of the *Subject*, without which neither the *Authority*, nor the *Wisdom* of the *Ruler* can do much; yet *People* are not very forward to see their *Interest* in this, but being prone to *evil*, and by Nature *corrupt*, *turbulent* and *unruly*, they are too apt to create *Quarrels*, foment *Disturbances*, and embroil *Affairs*, which always makes *Government* weak,

The PREFACE.

weak, often overturns it. Now in this case, true Religion is, if not the only, yet the chief Remedy; as that which alone can effectually procure the one, and restrain the other. All other Ties have not the strength of Pack-thread, and will be as easily broken as Sampson did his Wyths; because there is nothing else that can oblige the Subject to his Duty in Conscience. And unless he can apprehend the Eye of Heaven beholding all the most secret of his Actions, which when it pleaseth can punish him here, but will certainly hereafter deal him eternal Rewards or Punishments, according to his Behaviour in this Life, he will no longer regard the Commands of his Superiors, than they suit with his Interest or Humour; but if they cross either, or be uneasie, he will set them at nought, tho' they be never so just and necessary, if he thinks he hath strength to withstand them, or cunning enough to evade them: And tho' they may doubt of their ability to oppose the Power of Authority, yet they are very prone to presume upon their Skill, to outwit the Law. And tho' they are often caught in their

The P R E F A C E.

own Trap, yet this proves not so effectual a Warning to others, but that whatever Thoughts they may have of their *Strength*, they seldom fail to retain too great an Opinion of their own *Wit*, and at every turn to betake themselves to their as *foolish* as *wicked Politicks*. *Princes* therefore, whether they regard their *own Safety* or their *Subjects good*, ought by all lawful means to endeavour, that their People's Minds may be so truly and thoroughly possess'd with a Sense of *Religion*, that they may think themselves constantly obliged to the Practice of it: And then will those, who rule for God, govern most safely and honourably, when they rule by Him and his Assistance.

Upon this account in the general (tho' they were mistaken in the particular application, and therefore not justifiable) it was, that the wisest *Heathen Emperors, Kings and States*, would never endure, that the *Religion* of their *Country* should be *opposed* or *affronted*; as being sensible, that it was not possible to secure such Men firm to any *Humane Authority*, who were regardless of a *Divine Power*; and
jealous,

The PREFACE.

jealous, that upon opportunity no Mischief would be unattempted against themselves, by those who were not overaw'd by the Scourge of Heaven. Hence it is observable, that such Persons, *right or wrong*, were generally reputed *Atheists*, and suffer'd under the Accusation of *Atheism*. Under this Notion fell *Anaxagoras* and *Socrates*; and even our glorious *Christian Martyrs* were not try'd upon the *true Principles* of their Religion, but suffer'd under the *malicious* and *lying Suggestions* of being either downright *Atheists*, or Men of the *wilest Principles and Practices*, and such as were *dangerous* to all Government, and unfit to be suffer'd in *Humane Society*. And tho' much may be attributed to their *noble Sufferings*, which startled others, and made them enquire into that Cause, which inspired Men with such *unparall'd Courage*; yet seeing all the *World*, and *Hell* it self, were obstinately bent against it; it could hardly have prevail'd against Error, had not God by a *special Providence* maintained it, and supported those who embraced it; and seeing that

The PREFACE.

God designed it for the Good and Salvation of Man, it might certainly long e're this have possess'd the whole Earth, had not the *Degeneracy* of the *Professors* of it hinder'd its *progreſs*, by being a *Scandal* and *Discouragement* to the Reception of the *true and pure Religion*.

But tho' it may ſeem, that even a falſe Religion, furniſhed with Maxims for the ſecurity of Government, is much better, with reſpect to the Community, than no Religion at all; yet this fatal Conſequence attends it, that how ſerviceable ſoever it may be here, both *Rulers* and *People* ſhall eternally periſh under it hereafter. And indeed the benefit of it here is of no certainty. For diſcerning Men will diſcover the *Cheat*, and find out the *weakneſs* and *falſity* of it, upon which one of theſe two things will follow: Either that thence they will raſhly take up a *diſguſt* againſt *all Religion*, falſly concluding, that becauſe there are ſo many *wrong ways*, therefore there is none *right*, and ſo become *Atheiſtical*, and conſequently *dangerous* to *Government*; or elſe they will employ themſelves to find out that *only true Religion*,

The PREFACE.

ligion, which can minister sure *Comfort* to them here, and bring them to *Happiness* hereafter; and then this may provoke the *Supporters* of the *false Religion* to persecute them, which tho' they as good *Christians* take patiently, yet it will certainly enflame *God's Anger*: And that *Government* cannot be long *safe*, which hath *God* for its *Enemy*, tho' the *Suffering Subject* think himself bound in *Conscience* to give it no disturbance.

It is not therefore any *Religion* that will serve the turn, especially where the *Light* of the *Gospel* so gloriously and clearly shines forth, and we are assured of the *Truth* and *Purity* of *Religion*, by *Inspiration* from *Heaven*, attested with *Miracles*, and all the *Offices* and *Benefits* of it dispensed unto us by a *Succession* of *Pastors* deriving their *Authority* from *Christ* and his *Apostles*: And those, who are sincere in it, will never depart from it, whatever they suffer for it, as accounting these *light Afflictions*, which are but for a *moment*, not worthy to be compared to that *eternal weight of Glory* which they have set their *Hearts* upon. And as it

The PREFACE.

is not *any at all Adventures*; so it is not *many Religions* will do the business; for this exasperates Mens Minds against each other: And tho' *Truth* is of a *meek and quiet Spirit*, yet commonly those, who are most *erroneous*, are most *violent*; and tho' apt to call for *Moderation* in others, yet shew none themselves. Hence arise *Parties and Factions*, and these upon occasion ready to break out into *Seditious and Hostilities*, which will render any Government *uneasie*, and often *precarious*; and then it is next to *nothing*. It is therefore the *Interest* as well as the *Duty* of Governors to advance the *true Religion*, and endeavour that it be embraced and practiced by all. For then all their lawful Commands will be executed with readiness, and the Subject will obey for Conscience sake, which will make the Government *strong*, the People *ease*, and both *safe*.

But suppose *Truth* to have obtained a sort of a *Settlement*, must it then be left to shift for it self? Hath *Viciousness* its boisterous *Patrons*, and *Error* its eager *Defenders*? And shall *Truth* be forsaken
of

The PREFACE.

of all, and none appear in her Cause to maintain it? The *Artifices* of *Satan*, the *Inventions* of *Hereticks*, and the *Lewdness* of the *Wicked* will soon send *Truth* away packing, to the drawing down a *Curse* and *Judgment* upon a *Nation*, if there be not *Champions* on her side, as well as on the other. It's true, that *Truth* will be *Truth* still, when *Error* and *Wickedness* hath done all it can; but they shall be never the better for it, who do not embrace it, and stoutly abide by it; and they will certainly miscarry, who oppose and drive it from them. It is indeed a common Saying, that *Veritas magna est & prevalebit*; but that is in the Persons of its Assertors, and must be understood of the final Conquest of those who so resolutely stand by it, that they can never be induced to forsake it. It may well therefore be thought to become the *Wisdom* of *Governors*, when they have established the *true Religion*, to make a *Hedge* about it, and not let it lie in common for every *profane* and *humorous Person* to trample it under foot at pleasure. The Purity of *Faith* and
Manners

The PREFACE.

Manners can never be preserved without *Discipline*. It was never worse with *Israel*, than when every *Man* did that which was right in his own *Eyes*. Not to punish Crimes, is to encourage them, by which means they will soon get head, and be too strong for any *Government*; and then it cannot be far from *ruine*. The strictness of *Discipline* hath so fortified *Error*, as to enable her to boast herself for *Truth*; why then should *Truth* be denied the same advantage, which is her proper *Security*? And why should those, who ought to be *Defenders* of *Truth*, be more negligent of its preservation, than the *Sticklers* for *Error* and *Wickedness* are for their unjustifiable *Proceedings*? And when this *Hedge* is made about this *Vineyard*, it ought to be firm and good, and kept in repair. For if it be full of *Gaps*, that all sorts of *Cattel* may go in and out at pleasure, not only the *Hedge*, but the *Vineyard* it self will be quickly laid waste; and the *Occasional Comers* and *Goers* will not only disturb, but eat up or drive out those, who had the right to it.

When

The PREFACE.

When all this is done, yet a farther Care may be needful, that you be not imposed upon. For when *Error* and *Wickedness* finds it not safe to appear bare-fac'd, they will put on various disguises; the *Devil* and their own *Mother-wit* will furnish them with a hundred *Shifts* and *Devices*, to seem so really what they are not, as to deceive others. A watchful Eye therefore ought to be had, that *ill Principles* do not shelter themselves under the Pretext of *true Religion* and *Piety*, and *ill Maxims* taught and spread by those who seem to be eaten up with *Zeal* and *Godliness*. The *Devil* is never so dangerous, as when he appears like an *Angel of Light*. By this means the *Church* comes to be insensibly corrupted, and the *Purity of Religion* destroyed unawares. Nor is the *State* in this Case much more secure than the *Church*. For whatever troubles the one, will more or less affect the other; of which there are too many Instances: I shall only mention one, which is better known than warded against. When *Persons*, otherwise of strict Lives, and such high Pretences of *Piety*, as to become popular,

The PREFACE.

pular, and have gained the good Opinion of others, shall have imbib'd Principles of Rebellion, and so interwoven them with their Religion, as to become a part of it; it is then high time for the State to look to it self. For let such have their way, and not only true Religion must sink, but the State must be moulded to their humour: On the other hand, if they be cross'd, they think themselves bound in Conscience to rebel as fast as they can; and thus supposing that they fight God's Battels, the more they Murther, the greater service they think they do God; and if they fall in their wicked Attempts, they conclude they die Martyrs, and all is safe on their side. Thus their wicked Principles animate them with Courage beyond others, and fit them to do more Mischief, than those, who are seemingly the worst of Men. This (if we would give our Minds to learn any thing for our good) we might have learnt from the Cromwellian new Model, related by Dr. Bates (*Elench. Mot. rep.*) For in the Rebellion against King Charles I. the Royalists had generally the better of the Roundheads, till that

The PREFACE.

that crafty Fox Cromwell broach'd his *Enthusiasm*, which being greedily suck'd in by his *Party*, turn'd their *Brains*, and threw them into a *Religious Madnefs*; and then, in *new modelling* the *Army*, he entertain'd only such as were possess'd (and it little differ'd from a real Possession) with an *Opinion*, that they fought *God's Cause*: And having thus set up *Religion* and *Conscience* (as they wofully mistook it) against *Loyalty* and *Gallantry*, the *Desperateness* of the one worsted the *Bravery* of the other; insomuch that they barbarously *murthered* their *lawful King*, *butchered* his *faithful Subjects*, made the *Nation* a *Field of Blood*, and ruined multitudes of *good Families*, who many of them *feel* it to this *Day*.

It is no small *encouragement* to these *dangerous* sort of *Persons*, when either a *State* is so *negligent*, or they so *strong*, that by their *Ungovernableness* and *Disobedience*, they can not only defeat *wholesome Laws*, but procure to themselves *Privileges* beyond what the *good Subject* enjoys. For by this means they in some measure rather *give Laws* to the *Government*,

The P R E F A C E.

ment, than receive them from it; and this also animates them to struggle for more, and gives them hopes to attain the utmost they can desire; at which, if they can arrive, either *Governors* must be at their beck, or may be *dismounted* at pleasure. And besides, this is a vast *discouragement* to all *dutiful Subjects*: For when they find themselves ty'd up to harder Terms than such *Libertines* and *turbulent Persons*, they are strongly tempted to run in among those, with whom they may reap greater *Advantages*. For tho' no *Government* can subsist without good *Laws*, and a *due Execution* of them; and good *Men* think it their *Security*, and a *Blessing* to live under and obey them; yet the generality of *Men* are so fond of what they falsely call *Liberty*, that they are very prone to join themselves with those, who seem to enjoy most of it, and so strive for more, till they bring the *Curse* of *Confusion* amongst them, and *ruine* all.

When a Discourse runs on only in general, tho' some *Men* may be jealous, that they are slantingly aimed at, yet it is commonly more easily born with, because no

Man's

The P R E F A C E.

Man's Copyhold is directly touch'd: But if you make application, and come to Particulars, the whole *Party* presently cries out, that their *Rights* and *Privileges* are invaded; and then he, who hath provok'd this *Nest of Hornets*, shall have them all about his Ears: So that it is dangerous meddling in such a case. But since we are fallen into Times, wherein every *Mountebank* and *Quack* in *Religion* sets up for a *Doctor of Divinity*, it is a hard case, if a Man, who hath made it his study, shall not be suffer'd to put in a word or two with them: And I being one, who more seek Men's good, than value their anger; and being now *old*, and having not long to live, so that their utmost Malice, if it should rid me out of this wicked World, would not do so much harm to me as themselves, I shall adventure to mention one or two such extorted Privileges; but they shall be such as have been very little, if at all, taken notice of by others; though perhaps for that the more displeasing.

I will not enter upon a Discourse of Marriage, what is its Nature, what makes

The PREFACE.

it, and wherein its Essence consists; be that what it will, it hath always been thought fit, that it should be solemnly performed; and it being so weighty an Act, as to extend to the whole Life, all Civiliz'd Nations have thought it expedient, that it should be attended with the Blessing of the Priest. But seeing that by Marriage the Community is propagated and continued, it may claim its share in it, or at least for its own safety ought to be allowed to take some Cognizance of it. For it is by no means convenient, that a Community should consist of Whores and Rogues; nor could it long subsist so. But if all sorts of promiscuous, incestuous, secret, or pretended Marriages, which perhaps some may be firm to, and others at pleasure recede from, must be conniv'd at, I fear in a short time it would be little better. And therefore to prevent these Mischiefs, all Civil Nations have usually prescribed what sort of Marriage shall be esteemed lawful by, and satisfactory to the Community; so that the Man and Woman shall keep true to each other, and their Children be legitimate, and succeed to Civil Estates

The PREFACE.

Estates and Rights. To this end and purpose in this Kingdom, not only the Church but the State have prescribed a set Form, according to which all Marriages ought to be solemnized, which shall be satisfactory to the Government, and be accounted valid to all Intents and Purposes in Law: And this is the Act not only of the Ecclesiastical, but the Civil Power, and the Act itself for the greater Security recorded in the Tower of London! But now to what purpose all this, if those, who are refractory against it, may assume to themselves a Privilege to let it aside at pleasure, and do as they list? Some like not the Persons appointed to perform it, some the Time, some the Form, some will marry in their own way, and some will take one another's word. And I am told, that very considerable Lawyers have declared it as their Judgment, That these Marriages are good and valid in Law. I desire it may be here taken notice of, that I speak not of what is valid in *foro Conscientiae*, but what is so in *foro Civili*: I am against no Man's Liberty, that may consist with his Reputation, and with his and

The PREFACE.

others *Safety* here, and *Salvation* hereafter; and I think it hard, that *Children* should suffer for the *fault* or *folly* of their *Parents*, and yet they are often unavoidably, notwithstanding their *Innocence*, involved therein; which ought to make *Parents* more careful to prevent it. But if such *Marriages* be *legal*, I would humbly request those *Gentlemen* of the *long Robe*, who are of that *Opinion*, to solve me some few *Doubts* or *Questions*.

I. Suppose a Man marry in his own *humourous way*, and afterwards marries another according to the *Form* prescribed by *Law*, who knew nothing of the first supposed Marriage, which of the Two shall be reputed his *legal Wife*? If the latter, then the first was *illegal*. If the first, then the Marriage in his *own way* makes void his Marriage according to *Law*; and she, who was *legally marry'd*, shall be a *Whore*, and the other the *honest Woman*.

II. Suppose that he have *Children* by both these *Women*, which of these *Women's Children* shall by *Law* inherit?

III. Suppose no *Joynture* made, and the

The PREFACE.

the Man dies, which of these two Wives shall have a right to the Thirds of his real Estate? One would think the *legal Marriage* should give the *legal Right*; but then if the preceding *blind Marriage* cannot overthrow it, it must be because of its *invalidity in Law*; but if it can, to what purpose is any *legal Marriage* presum'd?

IV. Suppose two consent in *Marriage* after their *own way*, and the Man afterwards *denies* the *Marriage*, and saith she was only his *Whore*, where is her *remedy*? or how shall he be compell'd to own her, or live with her, or provide for her as a *Wife*?

V. Suppose the *Woman* so distasted as to *deny* such *Marriage*, and to *leave* him, and *marry* to another *Man* in such manner as prescribed by *Law*, what *Law* can enforce her to relinquish him, to whom she is *legally marry'd*, and to go and dwell with her first *Husband*, to whom she was perhaps *after a sort marry'd*, but *denies* it? And yet the *Law* ought to do this, if the *first Marriage* was *valid* and *legal*, with respect to the *Civil State*.

VI. Suppose two *marry* not *legally*,
a 3 but

The PREFACE

but by their own consent, may they not deny it again by consent; or part again by consent, or dispose of themselves otherwise by their own consent, notwithstanding any thing the Law can do to hinder it? I do not speak of what they ought to do; nor ask whether the Law cannot punish them in other respects? But whether the Law can interpose, as looking upon them as Man and Wife in the eye of the Law?

VII. Suppose a Man hath one Wife, whom he marry'd according to Law, and one or more Wives at the same time, whom he did not marry according to Law, can this Man be legally convicted, and made liable to the Punishment, which the Law inflicts for having at the same time more Wives than one? Do not think this an idle Question: For I could name the Man, who had seventeen Wives come after him, when he was in a Gaol for such Franks, and yet he came off; and, as I was inform'd, afterwards follow'd the same trade again. Now if a Person in such case cannot be convicted, besides one legal Wife he may have more Wives than the Alcoran allows, Turk, and yet be out of danger of Law.

I will

The PREFACE.

I will put no more such troublesome Questions, because I know not what to do with these, and should be glad to see the Learned in the *Law* clear the matter. But tho' I cannot solve these *Difficulties*, yet any Man may easily know how to prevent them. For let no Marriage be valid, with respect to *Civil Rights* and *Advantages*, but what is performed as the *Law* prescribes, and then none of these *Inconveniences* can arise, nor any of these *Difficulties* or *Mischiefs* follow thereupon. And here I should end this Instance, but that there now occurs to my Memory a Story very pertinent to the present case: During the time of our *uncivil Wars* there was a Man, who for his clamorous exerting himself against the *Church* and the *King*, was sufficiently known by the Title of *Bawling Marshal*, a Person of too great Parts to be so ill employ'd: This Man came to a Kinsman of mine, then Vicar of *Brixworth* in *Northamptonshire*, and desired his leave to marry his Daughter in his *Church*; my Kinsman readily granted his Request, and went along with the Company to *Church*, chiefly out of curiosity,

The PREFACE.

sity, that he might see how so celebrated a Man would manage the matter in those difficult times; and there, to his amazement, he saw Mr. Marshal marry his Daughter to one of the Saints, exactly in all Punctilio's according to the *Book of Common Prayer*. At their return to the Vicaridge House, my Kinsman, taking him aside, asked him, How he, who had spoken so much and so vehemently against the *Book of Common Prayer*, could satisfie himself in what he had done? To whom he reply'd in words to this effect: That the *Objection* was true, but yet he did not know, that the *Book of Common Prayer* was as yet by any Authority abrogated, and he was sure that no other legal way of Marriage was yet establisht; and seeing he gave his Daughter a very good Portion, he should be loth, if any thing should fall out beyond his expectation, to see his Daughter turn'd out of doors as a Whore, and her Children made Bastards, for want of a legal Marriage. Various Applications may be made of the Story, but I leave that to others.

Allow me for once the liberty to mention

The PREFACE.

tion only one more of these extorted Privileges, because I take it to be a Scandal to the rest of the Nation, and then I will have done. There are a sort of Men, who have made up a Religion out of a Complication of Old Heresies, which strike at the Root and very Being of Christianity: These Men flatly refuse to make Oath in any Court upon any Civil Cause or Tryal. But by the way you ought to know, that whatever they may pretend, the true Reason is, that it is a Privilege annex'd to their Perfection; for it is a Doctrine taken from the Popish Schools, that *Juramentum non cadit in perfectos*; and there is not one of these Men, but lays claim to Perfection, at least they did so when they first set up this Practice. But, alas, how perfect Men are we know not! and few or none such are to be found in this Life, which is not a State of Perfection: And be they what they will, Oaths are the highest Security, and made to satisfy the weakness and incredulity of others; and even God himself, who alone is absolutely perfect, so far condescended to the Infirmities of Man, that
when

The PREFACE.

when he could swear by no greater, he
swore by himself, (Heb. 6. 13.) And the
Apostle tells us, That an Oath for con-
firmation is the end of all strife, (Heb. 6.
16.) But be the Concern never so great,
and the Consequence never so dangerous,
yet these Men will not Swear. And up-
on this they have obtained a Privilege,
that their Affeuration shall pass in such
cases, wherein an Oath is required of all
others, as if there was not a Man in the
whole Kingdom to be believed upon his
Word but a Quaker. Those, who are so
apt to accuse them of Lying, cannot but
think it unreasonable, that this Privilege
should be granted them. And truly I
fear that others would look upon us as
the most infamous Nation under the
Heavens, if it should be granted, that
there are none among us so honest and
truly Religious as these Men; and doth
not such a Privilege tend to create such
an Opinion of us? But if others be as
credible Persons as they, why should
they not have the same Privilege, espe-
cially seeing that in all probability they
might obtain it, if they would less de-
serve

The PREFACE.

serve it, by being as *obstinate* as the other are.

If it were deliberately enquired into, in how many unreasonable Particulars *Government* seems to accept Laws from some sort of Men, rather than give any to them, it might make some bethink themselves. But I know I have done more already, than I shall receive any Thanks for; and therefore I will trouble them no farther, but leave them to themselves, and let *Ziba* take all for me. As a *Clergyman*, I think I ought to have a particular *Zeal* for the Establishment of true Religion; as a *Christian*, I wish well to all Men; as a *Native*, I heartily desire the safety and prosperity of my Country: But if I think such courses are not taken, as tend to procure and promote these things, I wish that I alone were mistaken, that all others might enjoy the happiness of it.

THE

END

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Discouragements of Writing, §. 1. Several Enemies of the Church, and who most dangerous, 2. Their several ways of attacking the Church, 3. The Person wrote against, 4. The Title considered, 5.

CHAP. II.

The State of the Case considered, §. 1. The unwarrantable Design of that Author, 2. He avoids the main Question, and for what reason, 3. Two Assertions maintained by him in the negative against all the Ancient Fathers, 4. His Pretence confuted, 5. A saying big with false and malicious Insinuations, 6. The Plea of Impositions considered, 7. Of Things doubtful, 8. Of Matters needless, 9, 10. The Case of the turn'd-out Ministers by the Barth. Act, 11. Disobedience to Laws, how far damnable, 12. The Opinions of Dr. Stillingfleet, Dr. Owen, and Mr. Baxter, concerning the Schism, 13. Of the Rule, whereby to judge of Schism, 14. His Army-argument, 15. Of Uniformity in Worship, 16. A frivolous Instance from Papists, 17. His Notion of Schism examined, and Bp. Sheldon vindicated, 18. Authority justified against his Fears and Jealousies, 19. Whether Persons guilty of Schism are Schismaticks, 20. His Notion of Schism considered, 21. Concerning damnable Schism, and who guilty, 22. Contradictory to himself, 23. A false Charge, 24.

CHAP.

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. III.

The Rashness of his Assertion, which he promiseth to prove in four Particulars, §. 1. The Opinion, if it were taken from the Roman Doctors, may be good, 2, 3, 4: That it is not taken from the Roman Doctors, 5. A short Answer to his Authorities, 6.

CHAP. IV.

The Opinion, that Schism is as great a Sin as Murder or Adultery, prov'd to be not against Scripture, §. 1. Objections answered, 2. The Text, 1 Cor. 13. 1, 2, 3. explain'd and vindicated, 3. Two Texts in St. Luke reconciled, and their meaning set forth, 4. Dr. Sherlock vindicated, 5. What Agreement necessary, 6. Separation from the Authority of the Church, separation from the Church, 7. The Citations from Mr. Hooker and Dr. Stillingfleet considered, 8. His Argument retorted, 9. Mr. Dodwell defended, 10, 11. That Schism destroys Charity, 12. The Author's mother-mistake confuted, 13.

CHAP. V.

The Author's Inconsistency in his pretended Designs, §. 1. A general Answer to his Question, Are they damn'd? 2. The Question unreasonable, 3. An Answer to the Instance of the Pharisees and Sadducees, 4. To the Dispute among the Disciples, 5. To the several Instances of the murmuring Grecians, the Jews contending with Peter, the Contention at Antioch with Paul and Barnabas, 6. To the Divisions among the Corinthians, 7. His Instance in Dintrephes, &c. full against himself, 8. The Difference in the Church of Rome concerning Meats and Days considered, 9. The Opinion (if true) That St. Peter and St. Paul were at the same time Bishops

THE CONTENTS.

Bishops of Rome no Precedent for the future, 10. His Guess from Clemens Romanus proved groundless, and St. Jerom's Mistake shewn, 11. The different Observation of Easter cleared, 12. The Novatian Schism, both at Rome and Carthage, considered, 13. The Contest between St. Cyprian and Stephen Bishop of Rome examined, and found to make nothing for his purpose, 14. The Case of Origen and his Writings as little, 15. So also the Difference between Petrus Alexandrinus and Meletius, 16. Nor the Bishops mutual Accusations burnt by the Emperor Constantine, anything affect this matter, 17. The Case of the Audeans considered, 18. And also that of Liberius and Felix and of Damasus and Ursicinus, 19. And that of Lucifer Calaritanus, 20. And of Aerius, 21. Of Priscillian, 22. The Divisions at Antioch after the Deposition of Eustathius, 23. The Case of the Donatists, 24. Of St. Chrysostom and the Joannites, 25. Of the Acephali or Hesitantes, 26. Of Austin and the Britons, 27. Of imposing the Gregorian Liturgy, 28. Of Ignatius and Photius, 29. Of the Schism between the Greek and Latin Churches, 30. Of several in the Popedom, 31. Of the Albigenes and Waldenses, 32. Of the Jesuits and secular Priests, &c. 33. The Author's Inconsistency, 34. Of the Lutherans and Calvinists, and the Remonstrants and Antiremonstrants, 35. His Partiality to the Hugonots, 36. And Malice against Episcopacy, 37. And the Non-jurors, 38. A general Answer to the Case of Protestant Dissenters, 39.

CHAPTER VI.

The Question not fairly stated, and how it ought to have been, §. 1. St. Cyprian cleared from the Slander cast on him, 2. How far the Fathers may be rely'd on, and the two Archbishops Whitgift

THE CONTENTS.

gift and Laud vindicated, 3. The Author's Concession, and impertinent Citation of St. Augustine, 4. Whether St. Cyprian be in this Case mistaken, and Schismatics be in or out of the Church, 5. St. Augustine, Optatus and St. Chrysostom vindicated, 6, 7. 8. The rest of the Fathers cleared from his Aspersions, 9. His ridiculous summing up his Evidence, with his Threatning at the end of it, 10.

C H A P. VII.

The Case of Communion with Schismatics and ignominiously propounded by the Author, more clearly explained, §. 1. The Fathers defended against his Objections, 2. His Denial of the Assertion not true, 3. The Rules of the Primitive Church against Communion with Schismatics, 4. Concerning the Force of Ecclesiastical Canons, 5. The Disuse of ancient Discipline, whether by Papists or others, no good Plea in his Case, 6. The Mitigation of Punishment in the offending Clergy against him, 7. The Case of two Bishops in one City, 8. His Argument borrowed from Mr. Selden not good, 9. The Case of the Lapsi against him, 10. The Plea of the Orthodox Communion with Novatians at Constantinople answered, 11. And that of the Orthodox with Arians at Antioch, 12. His Inference from the Example of Satyrus trifling, 13. Other Instances already answered, and his Boast vain, 14. That Schismatical Communion endangers the Faith, 15. St. Cyprian wronged by, and the Episcopal Power explained against him, 16. The Design of the Author discovered and confuted, 17. His Citation from St. Cyprian full against him and his Party, and farther, the Power of the Civil Magistrate in Religious Affairs considered, 18.

C H A P.

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. VIII.

That they ought better to explain their Meaning concerning Occasional Conformity, §. 1. His Explanation leaves it more in the dark, 2. Hypocritical Occasional Conformity both condemned and maintained by them, 3. He doth not discharge Occasional Conformity from Hypocrisie, much less prove it not sinful otherways: Their Actions no Rule to us, 4, 5. Want of other Opportunity, or Eloquence of the Preacher, no warrant to join in a Schismatical Communion, 6. The Objections made stand firm and good against him, 7. 8. Mr. Baxter's Example considered, 9. That the Reason he urgeth, and Examples he brings, do not reach or affect the Case, 10. His Answer to the Objection weak, but his Discovery plain, 11. None of the best Council given, but refused for worse; which yet will not support Occasional Conformity, 12. His Reasons to induce others to it frivolous, 13, 14. His Examples as bad, 15, 16. His idle Pretences and Projects for strengthening the Church, 17, 18. And ends in the old sham Cry of Popery, 19.

CHAP. IX.

Four Questions propounded, §. 1. The first resolved, 2. The second proposed, and some things premised, 3. Schism a continued Sin, 4. Fruitful of many other Sins, 5. An infectious Sin, 6. A rejecting of God's Authority, 7. An irreclaimable and most dangerous Sin, 8. The third Question propounded and resolv'd, 9, 10, 11. The last Question resolv'd, 12, 13, 14, 15. The Conclusion, 16.

Moderation

Moderation in Fashion :

O R,

An ANSWER to a late Treatise,

Written by Mr. Francis Talents,

ENTITLED,

A Short History of Schism, &c.

CHAP. I.

Discouragements of Writing, §. 1. Several Enemies of the Church, and who most dangerous, 2. Their several ways of attacking the Church, 3. The Person wrote against, 4. The Title considered, 5.

(1.) **I**N times, wherein Religion is fiercely attack'd from all Quarters, and Matters are carry'd by Bullying and Braving, by Noise, Liar and Slanders; though there never can be more need, yet there is small Encouragement for a sincere good Man to set Pen to Paper, and hazard himself against a brutish Crew, who proclaim War against Heaven, and account nothing so much their Enemy as an immoveable Honest Man. For when an Atheistical Toland is

B

adjudg'd

adjudg'd to be guarded by a *Statute of Praemunire*, against so much as a *bare Confute*, and the *Laws* of a *Christian Kingdom* are construed to be a *Protection* for *Atheists*; when an *Audacious Coward* is every where cry'd up as a most celebrated *Author*, for writing against the *Immortality* of the *Soul*, levelling Mankind with the rest of the *Brutes*, if it do not make him worse, what can an honest Man expect from confronting such Cattle, but (if he escape worse usage) to be made a *May-game* and a *Laughing-stock*; or at least to meet with Contempt and Neglect?

(2.) But since these *Desires* of *Heaven*, and *Debauchers* of *Mankind*, are so securely posted under the Safeguard of their *mighty Patrons*, I shall leave both the one and the other to the Judgment of the *righteous God*, who doubtless in his good time will vindicate his *own Cause* in such manner, as he in his infinite Wisdom knows to be most for his *Glory*. But though I leave these, yet (though I expect no thank for it) I shall enquire after another sort of Men, and examine, Whether *Religion* be not as effectually *betrayed* by some, who make strong *Preensions* to it, and would seem to have a mighty *Zeal* for it. Man is in Nature so much *Animal Religiosum*, that the *Atheist* can never prevail; the sense of a *Deity* hath taken such firm possession of Man's Breast, that he is stricken with horror at *Atheistical Expressions*; and it will return at times even upon the work of Men, and such who have made it most their business to eradicate it; so that it is not to be thought, that the *Atheist* does or can always believe himself: And therefore in my apprehension, though perhaps it may seem strange to some others, the most dangerous and fatal *Enemies* to true *Christianity* are such as pretend to it, but really undermine, corrupt and debauch it in its Principles and

and *Practices*; the Shaft that pierceth to its Heart must be plumed with its own Fathers. When the Powers of *Earth* and *Hell* bent all their Forces against it, and the Rage of *Heathen Emperors* made use of all Arts and Cruelties to destroy it, though it suffered in its *Professors*, it flourished in its *Purity*; the Fire of Persecution rather *refin'd* than *burnt* it, and it daily got ground in spite of all the Malice and Machinations of its Enemies: So true prov'd that Saying, *Sanguis Martyrum est Semen Ecclesie*. But when all this would not do, and Christianity became a glorious Conqueror over all these Difficulties and Dangers, the Devil found a way to raise a War in its own Bowels, which hath done it more mischief than all its other Enemies put together. For when the *Professors* of the *Christian Religion* became *Hereticks* and *Schismatics*, or through Ease and Wantonness grew loose in their *Lives* and *Principles*, then it was soon driven out of divers Countries, and forc'd to wander from Place to Place, till at this day it scarce any where finds any sure and quiet footing. There was once in this Island a Church as well constituted, and as near the Primitive Pattern, as perhaps any in the whole Christian World; but through the Pride and Discontent of some, Petulancy and Weakness of others, and Industry of the *Romanists*, strange and destructive Opinions were spread up and down in all places; and furious pernicious Sects arose, who in time grew to that strength, that with the Rebel *Presbyter* in the Van they durst openly oppose the Church, crying, *Down with it, down with it even to the Ground*; and they were as good as their word. For they thought they had left neither *Root* nor *Branch* of it; and the Land was over-run with such variety of Sects and monstrous Opinions, that some of themselves stood amazed to see it

such a Sink of Sin, and sadly complained of it. But when these Men had wearied themselves with their own Wickedness, it pleased God, beyond all Mens expectations, to raise this *Church* as it were from the *dead*, to make it a *Comfort* and *Support* to others, and to become once more the *Envy* and *Terror* of the *Romanists*, who before insulted as having got an absolute *Conquest* over it. One would think such a Deliverance and Blessing were to be prized, and with thankfulness to God, care taken to preserve it; at least, that in the same Age, and whilst many of the Persons, who saw and felt the former Desolations, are still living, the Floodgates should not be opened, that she might be swallowed up, and the Land overwhelmed with a Deluge of cankered Opinions, Heresies, and all manner of impious Principles and Practices; but it looks as if it were her Destiny to suffer Persecutions and Trials; for all the *Sectaries* are now let loose upon her; and it were well if some of her *Sons*, or such as ought to be her *Sons*, did not conspire with them to betray their own *Mother*; and how shall she be able to stand against *Enemies* without, and *Traytors* within? It must be confess'd, that Villany in this Age is more refined, their Politicks more neat, and the Proceedings and Pretences at least of some of them more smooth; but it is the *old Game* which is playing again, only the *methods* are changed: Before they were for downright *knocking* her o'th' Head, but now she is to be *bugg'd* to Death.

(3.) I shall not concern my self with the mad furious Zealots, though possibly they are the Men who most plainly and truly speak their Minds, and rashly discover the others real Purposes; for the present most dangerous Enemies of the Church, I take to be those, who would give her a *quieting Pill*, and lay her in a *sound Sleep*, whilst they cut her

her *Throat* with a *Feather* ; who pretend to *enlarge* her *Borders*, whilst they intend to *tear* out her *Bowels* ; who with fine healing *comprehensive Designs*, would swallow her up in *Confusion*, that they might erect their own *Idols* upon her *Ruins*. For they are of several sorts, and even contrary *Persuasions*, yet like *Sampson's* Foxes tyed Tail to Tail closely carry their several *Firebrands*, and can agree well enough to burn the *standing Corn*, and destroy all that is wholesomely and well established. These smooth Religious Politico's take several methods, as may best suit with their particular designs ; one comes abroad with an *Essay for Catholick Communion*, a noble and generous Undertaking, had it been pursued with equal Sincerity and Prudence : But when you come to examine the Matter, the Man's whole business is to carry us back into *Egypt*, and reconcile us to the *Pope*. Another deals yet more warily, and leaves his Book at Gentlemen's and other Houses, where he thinks it may find entertainment, or have some effect ; but with this care and precaution, that after so many Days liberty to peruse it, either the Book or the Set-price shall be return'd to him who first delivered it. I have not been thought worthy to be trusted with this ambulatory Piece, but am told by a good Hand, That in Title it pretends to Answer the *Arian* and *Socinian* Tenets, but that the Performance is quite contrary ; for it sets them forth fully, and with all advantage ; but then either answers them weakly, or plainly pleads for them ; and thus betrays the *prime Articles* of the *Christian Faith* : And I suppose the design of this worthy Author may be, with *Servetus*, to reconcile us to the *Turk*. These Men, whether conscious to themselves of their own deceitful Designs, or apprehensive that Matters were not

yet ripe for their purpose, conceal themselves from publick Knowledge, though no industry is wanting to spread their Books. But then comes another, who, well-back'd with his Party, and of no mean assurance in himself, with open Face lends a friendly lift to the Church, but in another manner: For he hath a Trick to make us all one, by jumbling us all together, and yet dividing us at the same time: He hath found out a way to heal all our *Schisms*, not by renouncing and forsaking them, but by such a contrivance, that there shall be no room for such a *Sin* as *Schism*. Now *Sacrilege* was long since struck out of the Catalogue of *English Sins*, and this worthy Man is sending *Schism* packing after it; and if we can from time to time thus drop one Sin after another, we may in time become a very innocent People; though I fear no Body will then believe it but our selves.

(4.) I am very sensible, that this learned Man is a Person of great Reputation, of a long established Authority, and little less than an Oracle among his Party; and therefore what he writes will be swallowed by them without chewing; and they will as certainly despise, and without farther Examination condemn any Man who shall dare to oppose him. For generally, it is not what is written, but who writes, that is now regarded. But seeing there are yet some left, who like those Noble *Bereans*, will search whether things be so; and because this Author, who is a Man of great Abilities, hath wrote in as seducing a way as most of our late Underminers, to prevent what in me lies farther Infection and Mischief, I shall be so bold as to examine his Performance.

(5.) The first thing which occurs, is the Title, which carries along with it so specious a Pretence, that it ought not to be pass'd by. It runs thus: *A short History of Schism; for the promoting of Christian*

Christian Moderation, and the Communion of Saints. Quid dignum tanto ferat hic Promissor hiatus? If the Book it self had been truly answerable to the Title, I should have esteemed it as a Jewel in these divided troublesome times, and have had the Author in no small Veneration; but, alas, *Falseness* is forc'd to hang out *Truth's Colours*, and the *fondest things* stand in need of being covered with the *fairest pretences*. It is reported of the *Hyena*, that she hides her Head, that the Beasts being attempted to approach near her to behold her beautiful Skin, she may leap on them, and seize them for her Prey: And so here, one thing is *pretended*, another *intended*; and therefore beware, *latet anguis in verba*: For if that may be called an *History of Schism*, which gives neither a fair account of the *Principles and Disorderliness* of *Schismatics*, nor of the *Judgment and Practice* of the Church, in reference to them, but lightly glides over Matters, the Author taking only what he thinks makes for his purpose, and modelling that also to his pleasure; then this may be called a *History*, which some will think they may modestly call a *Misrepresentation*. It must be confest, that it is *short*, if we consider the variety of Sects it pretends to account for; and yet is too *long*, unless it had been *better*. For a little is too much, when it is artificially fitted to deceive. This relates to the Matter of his Book, the Design of it (if you can believe him) is to *Promote Christian Moderation, and the Communion of Saints*. Now this his *Christian Moderation* is such an Unconcernedness for the Religion a Man professes, that he can *approve* of what he *dislikes*, and he hail fellow well met with those, whom in his real Thoughts he condemns. And his *Communion of Saints* is the running the Rounds through all the *several Communions*, that call

themselves *Protestant*, be they never so perverse, silly or ridiculous. The Lord deliver me from the new Notions of these fruitful times; for, till of late, I never heard that the *Communion of Schismatics* was the *Communion of Saints*. If his Book had the Title it deserves, it might have been this, or to this effect: *A Sham-History of Schism, for the promoting Confusion in Church and State, and the destroying all Rules of Christian Communion*. The Truth of which will appear from the Consideration of his Book, which I shall now enter upon.

C H A P. II.

The State of the Case considered, §. 1. The unwarrantable Design of that Author, 2. He avoids the main Question, and for what reason, 3. Two Assertions maintained by him in the negative against all the Ancient Fathers, 4. His Pretence confuted, 5. A saying big with false and malicious Insinuations, 6. The Plea of Impositions considered, 7. Of Things doubtful, 8. Of Matters needless, 9, 10. The Case of the turn'd-out Ministers by the Bar. At, 11. Disobedience to Laws, how far damnable, 12. The Opinions of Dr. Stillingfleet, Dr. Owen, and Mr. Baxter, concerning the Schism, 13. Of the Rule, whereby to judge of Schism, 14. His Army-argument, 15. Of Uniformity in Worship, 16. A frivolous Instance from Papists, 17. His Notion of Schism examined, and Bp. Sheldon vindicated, 18. Authority justified against his Fears and Jealousies, 19. Whether Persons guilty of Schism are Schismatics, 20. His Notion of Schism considered, 21. Concerning damnable Schism, and who guilty,

guilty, 22. *Contradictory to himself*, 23. *A false Charge*, 24.

(1.) **T**HE present business of this Author (tho' I think it only preparatory to a farther design) is not to state Matters right, but confound them; that he may lose his Reader in a Labyrinth, and make him renounce all steady Principles, and set up for an indifferency in the affair of Religion: To this end he is so full of doublings and turnings, saying and unsaying, that I shall be forc'd to follow him a Wildgoose-Chase, and of necessity must make a rambling Argument of it; though I hope to make some amends for it in the close. He begins with a Charge upon other Men: *It is said (saith he) by divers among us, that Schism is as damning as Murther or Adultery; that they who die in it, cannot be saved; that it's a sin to worship to God with such at any time: And they apply this to the Protestant Dissenters in England, &c.* And then adds, *That this is industriously instilled into the Minds of People, &c.* (p. 1.) I wish it had been so: For it might have prevented much of that misery we now labour under, and those mischiefs which are like to ensue. For what more Christian Course can be taken to prevail with Men (as holy Scripture directs) to *mind and speak the same thing*? What better way to preserve the *Peace and Unity* of the Church, and to procure *sincere Love and Affection* among Christians, than to make them sensible of the *malignancy and danger* of the Sin of Schism? But Schism is a Darling, and it will be scandalous to speak against it. For he tells us, *That these Assertions seem very false to many wise and good Men, and a great means to binder the power of true Religion, &c.* (p. 1.) Thus, when they want better Arguments, we are popt i'th' Mouth at every turn with the
Names

Names of *Great and Good Men, or Wise and Good Men*. The Sectaries never fail to have their own good Word; they will even out-do him that said to his Neighbour, *Stand off, for I am holier than thou*. For they will scarce allow any other but themselves to have any Holiness at all. But were not St. Ignatius, St. Clemens Romanus, St. Cyprian, and other blessed Fathers of the Primitive Times, who courageously propagated the Christian Religion in their Lives, and sealed the Faith with their Blood in their Deaths, as *wise and good Men*, as our upstart Presbyterians and Independents, or a Mongrel sort of *Lukewarm Doctors*, who upon occasion can be of this, that, or any Religion whatsoever? And I am sure those holy Fathers have said as severe things against Schism and Schismatics, as any that are here objected to us: And if we must be led by *wise and good Men*, I think it is no great question, which we should rather follow. And such is the force of Truth, that even Mr. Tallents himself, (forgetting himself and his Cause) as tender as he is of *Schism*, hath in this very Book given it as *hard words* as those he complains of, as shall appear in due place. I cannot understand how Peace and Unity, upon good grounds, and according to the measures left us by the Primitive Christians, should either hinder *the power of true Religion, or weaken the Church and Civil Government*; but that it is rather Unchristian Divisions, and the fierce bickering of Parties amongst themselves, that *sets the Hearts of People against each other, and provokes God's sore Judgments*. To prevent this, he declines the good old Way as unjust and insufficient, and sets up for a new Project, to cure Schism by not regarding it. But this, if it were not unwarrantable in it self, would not do for other reasons. For all those who were firm to, and sincere in their way, would grow jealous, that

that by this means they should be represented as indifferent or regardless to all others; and this would make them stand up for themselves more zealously, and enrage them against these Men of unreasonable Charity, who would render their Profession needless or precarious: And so instead of curing any of the *old Schisms*, we should have a new Sect of *Latitudinarian Schismaticks*. But this is his way, and we must try what he will make of it.

(2.) I could easily agree with him in his Inference, That if *Schism* in *whomsoever* it is, be as great a Sin as *Murder* or *Adultery*; then they that live in it, whether *Conformists* or *Nonconformists*, are in a state of *Damnation*, and none may worship God with them. But that which he principally aims at in this, and seems tacitly to suppose, is, That *Schism* is not so great a Sin, nor so damnable, but that Men may unconcernedly worship God with them: This I cannot comply with. For (not to Reason the Case at present) I cannot think so highly of Mr. *Tallent's* liberal Judgment, as for that to condemn all the first and purest Ages of Christianity, which had quite another Opinion of *Schism* than he would recommend to us. For you will scarce find, that they wrote and acted against any Sin with more vehemency; and that because they accounted none more dangerous to the Souls of Christians in particular, or to the Church in general.

(3.) He tells us, That he will not discuss this, whether the *Dissenters* be guilty of *Schism*; for that hath been largely done by many. If so many have done it, his Work would have been the easier for such Helps; and at this time, and in this case, it seems necessary, That that matter should have been first discuss'd. For to what purpose should we spend our Breath in enquiring concerning the Nature

Nature or Heinousness of a Sin, when at the same time we are endeavouring to acquit all Men of it? I find that sometimes Men are apt to conceal the true Reason of their Proceedings, lest it should be injurious to their Design: And therefore I am inclinable to think the true Reason of his declining the Discussion of this Point was, that it would have touch'd his Beloved Brethren to the Quick, and he feared they would be cast upon the Tryal; and then, let the *Sin* be what it will, they would have been found the *Guilty Persons*. It was therefore a more Politick course, and more serviceable to his Friends, to represent the present *Schism* as no *Sin*, than to hazard his whole Party by failing in his proof, that the *Dissenters* were not *Schismatics*. As for what he saith concerning their mutual charging each other with *Schism*, I did never expect that such hardy Men as his *Dissenters* should give up their Cause, and plead *Guilty*, whom I have often known to out-face plain Truth. But if the Question had been discuss'd, and set in a clear Light, unprejudiced and impartial Persons might have made a right Judgment, and it might have been useful to such as are doubtful, and to those who came after; and so have help'd to heal in time. But seeing he will not do this, I must follow him in what he will do.

(4.) Two Assertions he lays down as the Subject Matter of his Book: 1st, *That they who are guilty of Schism, live in a course of Sin as damning as Murder or Adultery, and are in a state of Damnation.* 2dly, *That we may not worship God with them at any time.* And this Course he makes choice of, because (as he saith) *few, if any, have expressly treated of these,* (p.2,3.) But this pretended Reason hath more of Confidence than Truth in it. For many of the Ancients have not only asserted, but proved

proved this Charge against Schism, and none more fully than St. *Cyprian*, with whom in this matter all the Orthodox Christians of his Age agreed: And then nothing is more common than to find them all with one Voice condemning all *Communion* with *Schismatics*, and proving it with all the force of Argument. And indeed if the *first* be true, the *second* is the direct and natural consequent of it: For we ought not to worship God with any, at any time, in a sinful and unwarrantable way. But the Ancient Fathers were mere Children, compared with the mighty Men of these blessed Times, and Mr. *Tallents*, with his new Light, discovers them all to be in the wrong, and will prove against them all, and all others, that Schism in these Days is no such dangerous Sin. Well then, *bic Rhodos, bic Saltus*, let us see what will come of it.

(5.) He sets out with a specious Pretence, That *it is only a certain Persuasion of the Falseness of those Things, and a Zeal to unite the Servants of Christ, that puts him upon this*, (p. 3.) I cannot say, how far mighty Prejudice, or (which is worse) the being given over to strong Delusions, to believe a Lye, may prevail upon Men. For we are told in holy Writ, that the Persuasion of some Men had wrought them up to such a Zeal, that they thought to *kill the Apostles of Christ* would be to do *God good service*: And we have known Men, who call themselves the *Servants of Christ*, and who would be the only *Saints* of the Age, who have *murdered* their *Lawful Sovereign*, and the *best of Kings* at his own Door, and *butchered* or *ruined* his *Faithful Subjects*. And if some such Servants of Christ (if without Horror they can be so called) be not now at work again, I am much mistaken; and is it not pity but such should be united, that their sanctified Designs for the
Ruine

Ruine of Church and State may be more easily and surely effected? But as for our Author, the Truth of his Persuasion, and the Warrantableness of his Zeal, will best appear from the Soundness of his Argument; which we shall now come to examine.

(6.) *It would look ill (saith he) in Dissenters to say, the Schism of those that procured severe Laws to be made against them, is as damning as Murther or Adultery: Truly I think so too. But then here is a whole Cluster of false and malicious Supposals. 1st, That a certain Set of Men enviously procured these Laws, which were certainly some wicked Churchmen. 2dly, That these Laws were severe, tho' they have not been severe enough to cure the Evil. 3dly, That these Procurers were Schismatics; and then doubtless the Makers of those Laws, who were of the same Mind, and did the Mischief, could not be less guilty. And thus the King and Parliament, and all our Governors, are condemned for Schismatics; and so shall doubtless all, who shall dare to disturb these Troublers of Israel. 4thly, That the procuring and making these Laws was a great Sin, though at present they are so favourable as not to proclaim it as damning a Sin as Murther or Adultery; but if we may guess at what may be, by what has been, it is very probable they may alter their Opinion, when they get the Power in their hands. These are fine moderate Insinuations, of which we may feel the blessed Effects in time. But if it were not dangerous to speak Truth, when it is in prejudice of our pious Dissenters, I should tell them, That it was Rebellion and Treason, and their ungovernableness and turbulence both in Church and State, which procured these Laws, and deserved severer. For though Mr. Tallents and his Saints may be of another Persuasion, yet I do and shall think, that Re-*
bellions

bellion and Treason are as damning Sins as *Murder* or *Adultery*. But after all, this makes nothing towards the proof his Assertion, though it well serves to discover his secret Spite.

(7.) You have now seen how much this their great pretended Charity amounts to, which must needs require a suitable return from those he calls their *High Opposers*. But he goes on, and though at present he finds it not expedient to parallel their Sin with Murder and Adultery, yet he plainly tells them, That *they have greatly sinned by causing such needless, doubtful, or sinful things to be imposed, on purpose to throw out abundance of useful Ministers, &c.* (p. 3.) I have observed, that both *Papists* and *Dissenters* have certain *stated reproachful Terms*, which they must by no means forego: Thus here it must not be said, that such things are *required* or *commanded*, but that they are *imposed*. Now an *Imposition* (as it is commonly understood in this case) doth suppose not only a hardship in the thing it self, but a stretch of Authority beyond its due bounds in the imposing, and consequently renders both the Thing required, and the Persons requiring it, odious: This Term therefore must be constantly made use of to alienate the Hearts and Affections of the *People* from their *Governors*, whether *Ecclesiastical* or *Civil*; it is a dangerous thing, and favours of a Seditious Spirit, when the *lawful Commands* of Superiors are constantly represented as *Impositions*. But our Author, to make good his Charge, hath followed the old Track, when he should have gone a new Way. For certainly he forgot his own design, and what it was his business to defend, when he accuseth them of *sinful Impositions*. For if the *Terms of Communion* be sinful, what shall become of his *Occasional Conformity*? For, unless his *Saints* have a peculiar Privilege to *sin occasionally*, I see not

not how Communion is justifiable at any time, where the Terms are sinful. If he had well considered the matter, he would certainly have dropt this Plea at this time; it may serve for *downright Work*, but not for *undermining*, which is the present business; and they might have had a fit occasion to resume it again, when they had been either prepared for open Defiance, or had the Power in their hands. However, when he shall prove such things *sinful*, I will renounce such a *Communion*, though I shall not then be of theirs, for Reasons I shall give hereafter.

(8.) I could wish our Author had farther explained himself, as to the things he calls *doubtful*. For present things, in their own nature, are not doubtful, but certain; if they be doubtful to us, it is by reason of the weakness of our Understanding, or for want of Information. And if the matter be *in equilibrio*, the safest way is to follow Authority. But some Persons are so full of Scruples, or are so easily made so, that if Authority shall command nothing, against which they shall raise a Scruple, or shall have it put into their Heads by others, there is an end of all Authority.

(9.) The third thing which he objects against his Impositions, is, that they are *needless*; which I take to be a very needless Objection. For if the Case were put, with respect to other matters, I verily think Mr. *Tallents* would not be easily persuaded to part with many things, which may be accounted *needless*. He would hardly be pleased to be confined to have neither any more *Money*, nor any more *Clothes*, than just what was *needful*. The *Prodigal* may have more Money than he *needs*, and yet that will not excuse his *profuseness*, and vain lavishing it away. The *Countryman*, who went to fother his Cattle with the last Bottle of Hay

Hay at his Back, said merrily, that he had *enough yet*; but if he had had more than a Rick to spare, I believe no Arguments of *needlessness* would have prevailed with him to set fire to it, or to give it away, or to spend it wastfully. Many excellent and profitable uses may be made of things, which in strictness of Speech, and in some respects, may be said to be *needless*: And therefore I think this Exception may go for Nothing, unless he can prove them *hurtful* in themselves; which he indeed sometimes in effect saith; but then you must take his bare Word for it, for he hath brought nothing that can make proof of it.

(10.) But after all, what if his Plea of *Needlessness* prove untrue? There could be no fair Pretence, that a thing is *needless*, if it were not *indifferent*. Now when the Question in such case is, What is fit or needful to be done? Who shall be the Judges, our lawful Superiors, or every Man for himself? If our lawful Superiors, then we ought to acquiesce in their Judgment, that such indifferent things are well and lawfully determined, and therefore not *needless* in such case: But if every Man shall judge for himself, then it is impossible there should be any Order or Decency in the Worship of God; nor can Authority interpose to prevent it, which in effect makes it null. Confusion must necessarily follow, if no indifferent thing can be determined. It is indifferent whether Men go to Church at the Ringing of a *Bell*, or the Sounding of a *Trumpet*; but since Notice is given for repairing to Church by the Ring of a *Bell*, not the Sound of a *Trumpet*, will it be sufficient for any Man to plead it in his Justification in abstaining from the publick Worship, That that indifferent thing is determined? But yet farther, there are some things indifferent in their own nature, which yet of necessity must

be determined; and the most rigid Dissenters ought to allow this, because they constantly practise it. *Time* and *Place* are Circumstances indifferent, yet the most violent of them all willingly submit to be limited herein for their Assembling together in their publick Worship. If every Man should say, You ought not to take upon you to restrain my Christian Liberty, and therefore I will not be ty'd up by you, but will come at what hour I think fit, and when and where I please. What wise Work would this make? At this rate how were it possible for their Humours to be gratified, or any publick Worship to be upheld? Now if *Time* and *Place* may be determined, why not *Habit* and *Gesture*, and the like? The Plea of Necessity can here make no real difference. For if they have no Authority in indifferent things, let the necessity be what it will, they have no power to determine it; but if their Authority do extend to such things, then they may determine the one as well as the other. And indeed, if all things were duly considered, I believe it would be found, that Order and Decency in Worship are as necessary as *Time* and *Place* for it. But the perverseness of the *Dissenters* appears in nothing more palpably, than in this, that they quarrel not at many things, wherein they are limited themselves; but are outrageous against some things, which being prescribed to others, do not oblige them. For instance, What a horrid thing is it accounted for a Minister to wear a *Surplice*? Indeed if they were all commanded to wear *Surplices*, perhaps they might have just cause to complain of it, as being a thing extremely burthensome; but what need they concern themselves what Clothes the Minister wears? Whether he appear in a *Surplice* or a *Jump*, a *Gown* or a *Cloak*? And yet there is a greater Outcry against this, which

which they are not bound to do, than against all those things, which they think themselves obliged to do either constantly or occasionally.

(11.) From what hath been said, it may appear, that neither ought those *Commands* of their Superiors to be called *Impositions*, neither were the things required unlawful; and therefore it is spitefully said, that *they were imposed on purpose to throw out abundance of useful Ministers*. If Men will be refractory against lawful Authority, and suffer no Rule or Order in the Church, it is fit such ungovernable Persons should be thrown out; and if they will complain without a *cause*, they must be pleased without *amends*. But if the Matter were well examined, I am confident it would be found, that no small Number of his *useful Ministers* were turn'd out as *Intruders* into the lawful Possessions of other Men, who thro' God's Mercy had over-liv'd their barbarous Usage to claim their Right, and be repossessed of their own. As for the rest, they turn'd out themselves, they might have had what they had got even by *Rebellion* and *Treason*, if they had not obstinately refused to comply with their *lawful* Governors in *lawful* things. What Reason could a *King* have to entrust those *Persons* with the *Instruction* of his *People*, who owned the Obligation of a *Rebellious Covenant*, which had destroyed his *Father*, and would justify the same Proceedings against *himself*? With what *Prudence* or *Conscience* could the *Church* cherish those *Serpents* in her Bosom, who had laid her so waste, that they thought they had destroyed both *Root* and *Branch*; and instead of repenting of their Doings, continued still of the same Mind, when they wanted the Power? Some Men would persuade us, that they are very harmless Creatures, when they cannot do mischief, though they want no good will to it; and

if Governors restrain them, it must be accounted their *great Sin*. Thus if a lawful Government lets them into the Power, it shall be certainly overturn'd; if it will not, no small Sin lies at their door: Which is the same thing as to say, that I shall be *damn'd*, if I do not quietly suffer a *Villain* to cut my *Throat*. They may trust them, who please; but I think we are like to have *bles-sed Times*, when such become *Favourites*.

(12.) He proceeds to tell us, That *our Princes and Parliaments* were far from imagining, that all who should not obey their *Laws* for Conformity, should be *damn'd* for that, (p. 4.) Damning is a hard word; but I know not how our Author came by the License to *imagine* for them. Their *Laws* were made to direct what was to be *done*; the *Penalties* were for restraining or correcting *Disobedience*. *Obedience* is the primary end of the *Law*, and the design of the *Legislators*; and therefore as it was their *Interest*, so in reason it must be their *Charity* to wish, that there might be no cause for any Man to *suffer*. But then their *Jurisdiction* is limited to this *Life*, they have nothing to do with another *World*, the Keys of *Hell* are in another Hand. But though they cannot send to *Hell* so easily as to *Newgate*, nor entail *Damnation* upon their *Malefactors*, yet there may be such cause for it, that *God* may do it. For he that hath told us, That *we must be subject*, not only for *Wrath*, but also for *Conscience sake*, (Rom. 13. 5.) hath given us fair warnings to beware how we disobey their lawful Commands, lest he take the matter into his hand, and revenge it farther than they can. And though neither *Kings* nor *Parliaments* can condemn a Man to *Hell*, yet there is another *Power*, I mean that of the *Church*, which, *clave non errante*, may affect us as to another *Life*; for no less than our Saviour himself leaving

leaving them this Power, and saying, *Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retained,* (John 20. 23.) He doth hereby plainly assure us, that their Sentence, regularly and justly pronounced, is confirmed in Heaven; and if they give over unto Satan, God doth so too. And if Men are so prone to condemn the Sentence of the Church, because she cannot punish them in their *Bodies*, nor *Estates*, nor hath any *coercive Power* but what is *Spiritual*, I think (if they well considered it) they would, for that very Reason, much more dread it.

(13.) It seems to me but a shifting Reason, which he gives, why he *intends not to enter into the Disputes concerning Schisms or Divisions in Churches, or from Churches, or who are guilty of them.* For I think this a most necessary Point, and ought to have been done in the first place; because our Christian Practice, as to publick Worship, and the safety of our Communion therein, depends upon it. But I must let him do as he will; for be it never so necessary, I cannot make him do what he will not. He saith, *That's done by many on all sides:* And must we go hunt after all them, before we go on forward with his Book? This were an unreasonable Task, especially if it be considered, how peevishly and perversely it is done by too many. But to shorten the Work, he refers us on the one hand to Dr. *Stillingfleet*, who (he saith) *charges it on the Dissenters*; and to Dr. *Owen* and Mr. *Baxter*, who lay it on their *High Opposers*, (p. 4.) Dr. *Stillingfleet* wanted not a kindness for them, and his Judgment in this case is the more considerable; because it is plain, that only the force of Truth prevailed on him to declare, contrary to the Prejudices of his Education, against a Party, which he was inclinable enough

to favour. Dr. *Owen* indeed was more firm to the Party and Business he was brought up for, than *Franciscus à Sanctâ Clara*, alias *Christopher Davenport*, who was originally designed for the same purpose; but not to concern our selves, how far Interest, joyned to long-rooted Prejudice, may prevail with an haughty Man, his Judgment can be no more valuable than his Reasons, which is not my present business to consider, nor need I, for others have already done it. As for Mr. *Baxter*, it matters not much on which side he was; for his Practice and his Writings were a Riddle, and heap of Contradictions: And be it so, that he charged the *Schism* on the *High Opposers*, yet he was not so stiff, or settled in his Opinion, but that he might have been prevailed with to lay it to the *Dissenters*. For he made great Friends and earnest Suit for the Rectory of *Chiselmurst* in *Kent* (which happened to be void about the time of the Fire of *London*) and that he might obtain it, made repeated Promises of *full and constant Conformity*; but it being disposed of to another, he kept his old Post: And what such a Man's Judgment is to be accounted of in this case, let any Man judge. But however the determination of the Matter lies not upon what these or other Men Thought, but upon the Merits of the Cause, of which our Author seems to think very meanly, as if these great Men, and all these Parties, had all this while so fiercely contended about a Matter of Nothing. For when he saith they so lay the Schism, he puts in this reserve, *if there be one*; by which he seems to shew himself doubtful, whether there be any such thing amongst us at present as a *Schism*; and indeed, if he could be constant to himself, he makes it his business to shuffle it to and fro, till he has lost it.

(14.) Our Author might have known (and doubtless did, though he thought it not convenient to acknowledge it) that though Mr. *Hales*, with a scornful dissenting Zeal, once called Schism a *Theological Scarecrow*, yet he became of another Mind, and return'd from it into the Bosom of the Church. However, I am glad that at present he seems not willing to have it so meanly thought of; and though he hath said nothing to the purpose all this while towards the proof of his Assertion, yet now he seems to prepare for it, to which end he lays down this Position: *It is certain the holy Scripture is the only sure and perfect Rule whereby we are to judge of Schism.* If it be so, to what purpose then do you run away from it, to give us a rambling History through so many Centuries? Why did you not stand to that Rule? I am as willing as your self to acknowledge *holy Scripture* to be a *perfect Rule*, and I think I have proved it to be so against the *Romanists*; but then it is so in its kind, and for which it was intended; it doth not supercede the use of other Rules, which are helpful in themselves, and subservient to it. It neither teacheth us *Grammar*, nor *Logick*, nor the like; it *commands* and *forbids*, but rarely gives us *definitions* of things, but supposes us to have known them, or may learn them otherways. As for Instance, The Scripture saith, *Thou shalt not steal*: But Mens Titles to their Estates are not to be found in Scripture, but it supposeth Property to be settled by reasonable and equitable Humane Establishments, which this Scripture-Law confirms. If a *Rogue* should rob Mr. *Tallents* of his *Plate* or *Money*, and upon complaint he were put to it to make out his Right to them only by *Scripture*, exclusive of all other Proof, I am afraid he would be cast, and so receive a double Injury. If *Humane Laws* were set aside, and Men should ad-

vance Mr. *Hobbs's State of Nature* in their room, and make all things *common*, notwithstanding this *Scriptural Prohibition*, it would be a difficult thing to make out such a thing as *Theft*; and so we might send away this Sin after some others, to the great comfort of *Higb-way-men* and *House-breakers*, *Lifters* and *Pickpockets*, and the rest of that precious Crew, which already too much abound amongst us. *Scripture* doth not make useless all *Arts* and *Sciences*, and *Legal Establishments*, but where they properly take place, serves it self of them. We might have known what was Schism, and felt it in the sad Effects of it, though the *Scripture* had never mentioned it; but seeing *Scripture* condemns it as an heinous Sin, we ought to be careful, that we be in no wise guilty of it, though it be not there nicely defined. And indeed, though the *Scripture* by way of prevention doth forbid and condemn all Schism, yet whilst the Apostles liv'd (from whom we received the *Scriptures*) by reason of their extraordinary Gifts, and super-eminent Power, which extended to all, and was acknowledged by all, it was scarce possible that such a Schism should arise, as we are now contending about; if there were any such thing, the Case of *Diotrephes* seems to me to come the nearest to it. But though we are not in haste to exclude all other helps, yet we are willing thus far to go along with our Author, in giving *Scripture* the preference in this and the like cases, and are ready to be determined by it; nor do I doubt, but it will furnish us with sufficient Matter for our purpose, as we shall have occasion to discourse it with him.

(15.) In the very next Paragraph our Author leaves the *Rule of Scripture*, to follow the *Law of Arms*. And I think he could not have stumbled upon a more unlucky Similitude for his purpose, than

than to alledge, That *Order in a Church, as well as in a Kingdom or Army, is useful and necessary.* For if his *beloved Dissenters* were brought under *Military Discipline*, it would certainly teach them *better Manners*, and *greater Observance* of their Superiors. I must confess, that Soldiers are apt to be more boysterous and rude, than most Men can approve of, or than I believe our Author will commend; but Disobedience to their Commanders is always severely punished, and often inexpiable. And if such strict Rules be by his own Confession *necessary* for the Management and Government of an *Army*, is it not an excellent Argument to prove, that all *Disorderliness* ought to be allowed in the Armies of the Living God, the *Church Militant*, and that all Men there may bid defiance to the Commands of their lawful Superiors, and do as they list? Is there no hope of taking a Town, or winning a Battel, unless such strict Order be kept? And do we think to conquer our Corruptions, and gain Heaven by being Masters of Misrule? Our Author should have said nothing of this, but Men sometimes forget themselves.

(16.) He acknowledgeth the force of this Reason to be so great, that it prevails with *many considerable Persons, who like the Dissenters well, to stick constantly to the established Church.* And so it doth with many, who whether they like the Churchmen well or not, to stick constantly to their own *Conventicles*; and whatever are their Errors otherways, according to their Principles so far they seem to be in the right; For Communion ought to be entire and the same. But what a rare thing is a quick Invention? He hath found out a Trick to evade all this. For (saith he, p.6.) *things may be done decently and in order, where there is not Uniformity, but a great variety in lesser things, &c.* As for Uniformity in every thing,
even

even to the least Punctilio, I do not think that it was ever expected, desired, or so much as thought of; and if he thinks there can be *Decency* and *Order* without any *Uniformity*, I desire him to expound his Riddle. But the true Question is, Whether or no there shall be such an *Uniformity* as is prescribed by our Lawful Superiors for *Decency* and *Order*? And if this must not be, I cannot see how there can be any *Order* or *Decency* in the *Worship*, or how it is consistent with any *Authority* in *Governors*. For of necessity some things must be determined, and if that must be left to the *Mob*, in all likelihood they will be so far from agreement, that greater *Confusions* and more *Quarrels* will daily arise; besides that, by this means all *Authority* of Superiors ceaseth.

(17.) So desperately in love with his *Variety*, or rather *Confusion*, is our Author, that he cannot forbear to bring the Example of *Papists* to justify his *Dissenters*. What a horrid Outcry against *Papery* had been raised, if any of us had done the like? The very *Papists* (saith he) amidst all their *Impositions*, seem to have a careful Eye to that, in allowing so many *Religious Orders*, though much differing from each other. I think his variety of *Sects*, and their many *Religious Orders*, may in some respect be well joined together. For they promote the same mischievous design, though by different means. However his Instance will not serve his purpose, but rather make against him. For all those *Religious Orders* are allowed by their *Ecclesiastical Superiors*; and tho' they are bound to certain *Religious Exercises*, and lie under certain *Restraints*, yet they are all of the same *Communion*, and pay the strictest *Obedience* to their *Governors*. If his *Dissenters* should do the like, they would lose their Name, and the Quarrel would be at an end, If they would become
of

of a peaceable Temper, and learn Obedience, they should have the liberty with all our Hearts to be more Religious than others, if they could, and to put themselves under what lawful Restraints they pleased; but it is not *Restraint*, but *Looseness* and *Licentiousness*, which they are for. His Instance therefore, if he thinks it valid, doth condemn, not enforce, the Practice of the *Dissenters*. Indeed I have many things, which I think may be justly objected against those *Romish Orders*; but that is not my present business.

(18.) I did expect that so great a Man would have proceeded fairly, and set himself evidently to disprove the Assertion, which he professeth to oppose; *That Schism is as great a Sin as Murder or Adultery*. But hitherto we have nothing like it, nor any thing but rambling. He now enters lightly upon the Notion of *Schism*; and I shall be glad to find it introductory of any Proof. *Most* (saith he, p. 7.) *look on nothing as Schism but only a rent or separation from a Church without a just Cause; but 'tis certain, Schism is also a rent or division in a Church; and the Scripture mentions that Contentions, Envoies and Divisions among Members of the same Church*. I am to learn who those are, who will allow nothing to be called Schism, but a Separation from a Church; I can easily grant him, that there may be Schism in a Church as well as out of it. But this distinction makes little to the purpose. For suppose Schism either to be an equivocal Term, or that the Word is used sometimes in a larger, sometimes in a stricter Signification; it little matters how many things may be called Schism, but our business is to state and ascertain that *Schism* which we dispute about; and then to enquire, whether it be a greater Sin than *Murder* or *Adultery*. The Schism we speak of, is not every little Quarrel, or Jangling of Persons; but is
of

of that nature, that if it can at all, yet it can never with safety be suffered or let into the Church. And therefore let him exclaim against Bp. *Seldon* as much as he please, I must confess that I am of his mind, That *I had rather have a Schism out of the Church than in it.* For the *infectious part* either going off, or being cast out, the other may be preserved *wholsome and sound*; but let it in, and it *infects the whole*, sets *fire* on the *Church*, and tends to the Ruine and Destruction of all. Nor is it fair and candid dealing to explain Bp. *Seldon's* Saying contrary to his Meaning, concerning *Schism out of the Church: That is* (saith he) *out of the National Church of England; for all Schisms are in the Universal Church: since all out of it are Jews, Mahometans, or Heathens.* For this Assertion supposeth one of these two things, or both; 1. That a Man may be a Member of the *Universal Church*, and yet no Member of any *Particular Church*: Or, 2. That he may renounce the Communion of his *particular Orthodox Church*, or be rightfully ejected out of it, and yet continue a Member of the *Universal Church*; both which are false, and diametrically opposite to the Judgment and Practice of all primitive Antiquity. No Man was thought a Member of the *Universal Church*, who was not admitted by Baptism into some *Particular Church*, and continued under those *lawful Ministrations and Powers*, by which *Grace and Succours* are conveyed to them; and if any separated from their *Orthodox particular Church*, or were ejected out of it, they were rejected by the whole Church. This is plain from their *Dimissory Letters* given to *Travelling Christians*, testifying their *Orthodoxy*, without which they were not admitted to Communion in other Churches; and from their certifying other Churches of Persons *excommunicated* by them; they never received one anothers *Excommunicates*,
when

when the Excommunication appeared to be just; but such Persons were deemed to be ejected out of the whole Church of God. The *Finger* cannot be a *Member* of the *Body* but by being joyned to the *Hand*, and if it be separated from the *Hand*, it will be separated from the *whole Body* as much as from the *Hand*. And if he could make it good, that *all out of the Universal Church are Jews, Mahometans, or Heathens*, it will be small comfort to his Schismatick, let his Pretences be what they will. For he might have remembred, that no less than our blessed Saviour himself, saith, (*Mat. 18. 17.*) *If he neglect to bear the Church, let him be unto thee as a Heathen Man and a Publican.* i. e. Let him be looked on as a desperate deplorable Sinner, whose Condition is no better than a *Heathen*.

(19.) It is well we can agree in any thing; but I know not to what purpose he tells us, That *it's agreed by all, that those who cause Divisions and Dissentions in or from a Church are the Schismaticks*, (p. 7.) unless he had a mind to condemn themselves. For whereas he subjoins, That *Schisms are caus'd both by imposing and opposing things without a just cause*, it hath been sufficiently proved by others, and may be farther in the process of this Discourse, That (if it must be called *imposing*) nothing is imposed or required by our lawful Superiors, but what is within the Verge of their Authority; and therefore *opposing* such things, even to a Separation, must necessarily be *without cause*, and consequently they must be the *Schismaticks*. As for his *Fears*, which he intends for *Reproaches*, they may deserve to be taken notice of, when he can shew just cause for them. But there are a sort of Men, who, that they may affright and terrifie others, will be pretending to *Fears*, where no Fear is; and if we are become insensible already

ready of what we have suffered by vain *Jealousies* and *Fears*, we are fit for the *Cheat* again, and it looks like a Judgment denounced against us, that we should be once more undone by the same means, and perhaps fatally; the Lord avert it.

(20.) To palliate the Sin of Schism, he tells us, (p. 8.) That *it's not proper to say, all that are any way guilty of Schism are Schismatics*. I wish with all my Heart, that this Gentleman would give his mind to speak properly, and not endeavour to impose upon his Reader with ambiguous Speeches, and random Discourses. For he knows well enough, that we concern not our selves in this Dispute about several things which he is pleased to call *Schism*, and therefore do not think them to be very properly called *Schismatics*. But, nevertheless, may not they who are any way guilty of *Schism* be so far called *Schismatics*, as their Guilt extends? If the Guilt of *Schism* be their Sin, what can their Denomination be but *Schismatics*? And yet this doth not make all alike guilty, nor all alike dangerous *Schismatics*; though *Schismatics* they must be in some sense, if they are any thing. But if this should hold, he thinks all that *any way break the second Commandment* might be called *Idolaters*; which he cannot yield to, (tho' by the way it seems strange to me, that these Men, who have been so apt to find Idolatry in almost every thing, and cry out horribly against it, should on a sudden become so favourable to that Sin) For (saith he) *by the same Reason, all that are sinfully angry, are Murtherers; all that have sinful desires, are Adulterers, &c.* but this, he tells you, *is notoriously false*. But with his good leave, I hope not so very notoriously false, seeing Christ himself tells us, That *whosoever is angry with his Brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the Judgment, &c.* (Mat. 5. 22.) And that *who-*
soever

soever looketh on a Woman to lust after her, hath committed Adultery with her already in his Heart, (ver. 28.) What fair Quarter can we expect from these, who will not spare the Lord that bought us? And yet I perceive it is possible sometimes to have them in a yielding temper: For if we would but compound with them for the Sin of *Schism*, they seem not (at least at present) unwilling to cast us many other Sins into the bargain.

(21.) He goes on with his Discourse concerning such *Schism* (for *Schism* he will call it) which consists in *Misunderstandings*, *Differences*, or *Wranglings*, without breach of *Communion*. Now in this case perhaps the offending part may be justly charg'd with *Weakness*, *Anger*, *Hatred*, *Uncharitableness*, or the like; and at this rate we may make every Sin *Schism*: But this is not properly *Schism*, at least not the *Schism*, concerning which is the present dispute, and so is nothing to the purpose. For though we could wish, that there were no such Quarrels, yet whilst Men are Men on Earth, there will be such; and we are forc'd to bear with what we cannot help; and therefore in this case he hath no cause to complain of us. These things indeed tend towards *Schism*, and often break out into, and cause *actual separations*; but till they do so, they are not *Schism*, properly so called, and such as our present Controversie is about. Yet he will tell us, That *all that are not joined to the faithful Servants of God*, (by whom I suppose he means themselves; for, if you believe them, they are all *Saints*) *but have their Hearts set against them, are really guilty of Schism, though they worship God with them, and come to the same Table of the Lord*. This is not very favourably spoken of his lowest sort of *Schism*, though the design of his Book was to make it either *no Sin*, or a very *diminutive* one. But (saith he) *Thus Cain was a great Schismatick*. Was
Cain

Cain then an *Occasional Conformist*? Pray put him into your Calendar of Saints, for we desire none of his Company. But here is another Companion for you: For though *Popery* is the Cry at every turn, yet the Authority of a *Papist* is unquestionable, when the *Dissenters* can serve themselves of them; and just now he hath luckily found out one (*Tolet*) for his Voucher, that *Schism* is often committed inwardly, without any external Act. I do not deny, but that it may have a tendency to Schism, and in some degree partake of its Nature; but then certainly the external Act and open Separation is much worse, which is the thing which ought to have been spoken to.

(22.) After all this loose discourse, which serves only to amuse his Reader, at length he is pleased to distinguish of Schism, and fairly confesseth, (p. 9.) That some kinds of Schisms are exceeding great Sins, and as damning as Murder or Adultery. So far good: But I cannot understand why he should say, That Schism is not so easily known, and notoriously visible, as those Sins are. For is not an open stated opposite Communion, and publick Defiance of Authority, as easily known and notoriously visible, as Adultery, which for shame seeks privacy; or Murder, which unless in some cases is not openly committed, and then not in the sight of many? But to let this pass, we will be content with what he saith, That this is among the greater sort of Sins, for which Men shall receive greater Damnation; such Schisms as proceed from great Blindness, bitter Zeal, hatred of true Godliness, worldly Interests, horrible Pride, and the like, which make havock in the Church. These are among the biggest sort of Sins, and cannot consist with Charity, and bring in a state Salvation. Now let a just Application of this be made to the present Case, and then this Confession will confute all the

the rest of his Book. For let him make as many sorts or degrees of Schism as he pleaseth, I desire to know, what sort of Schism that is, which riseth higher than a violent stated Separation, contempt and trampling upon Authority, obstinate Opposition of Truth, and the Encouragement of bitter Feuds, all manner of Disorderliness, and the utmost havock of the Church? This is the present Case, and plain matter of Fact; and therefore by his own Confession the present Schism must be *as damning a Sin as Murther or Adultery*, let it fall where it will. I suppose he thought he had acquitted his Party, when he makes Schism of this nature proceed from *great Blindness*. For though sometimes they can shelter themselves under the name of *weak Brethren*, yet now they would let us know they are *strong*; and so they had need to be, when they dare *Legion* both Church and State; but it is not *Conceit* or *Pretences* that makes Men *wise*; if it would, the most infamous Hereticks, the *Gnosticks*, had been the most *knowing Men* in the World. Then, as for his *bitter Zeal*, and *hatred of true Godliness*, it is not calling themselves the *Godly Party* that will make themselves so: Men may be grossly mistaken, who think highly of themselves. St. Paul tells us, that he once *verily thought, that he ought to do many things contrary to the Name of Jesus of Nazareth*, (Acts 26. 9.) and the blessed Jesus himself told his Disciples of a time coming, *that whosoever killed them, would think he did God service*, (John 16. 2.) these Men did not think they were *Haters of true Godliness*, and yet at the same time were most *bitter Enemies* of it. We have known the *Zeal* of our Adversaries, and felt it to be *bitter* enough; and therefore, though to gain their ends they would seem to cajole us, it were weakness to think that *Presbyterians* in *England* and *Scotland* are not the

D

same,

same, if they had the *same Power*. And then for *worldly Interest*, I think you may let them alone; let this Charge fall upon them, who are most sharp and over-reaching in their Dealings; and I would gladly be inform'd what Root it springs from, if not from worldly Interest, that they now plainly declare, that they will not be satisfy'd with the quiet Enjoyment of their *Religion* and *Conscience*, unless they may alter the frame of the Government, and have the *Power* in their Hands. The last Cause he is pleas'd to assign of *dammable Schism* is *horrible Pride*; and I think none more *horrible* than *spiritual Pride*; and what sort of Men are more ready than these to say to their Neighbour, though never so sober and modest, if he be not of their Opinion, *Stand off, I am bolier than thou?* I am sorry to mention these things, and say it not to reproach them, but with a design to persuade them well to examine themselves, and better consider of things, and try whether they can in good earnest discharge themselves from being the Cause of the present devouring Schism; to which end I shall lay before them some things of greater moment in the close.

(23.) When our discourse is or ought to be concerning a Schism, where Altar is set up against Altar, and a pretended Authority, in it self none, against a real and true Authority, I think it needless and impertinent to launch out into a discourse about *Schisms*, which he saith *are of a lower Nature*. But since he confesseth, that even *these Schisms are Sins against God, hurtful to the Church, and provoke the Lord to correct People that are guilty of 'em more or less many ways; sometimes in their Souls, by withdrawing his gracious Presence, and writing bitter things again them; oft in their Bodies and outward, Concerns, sometimes even by shattering and destroying Churches*. And then professeth, that he is far
from

from writing this to flatter any in their Schism, or to encourage any wantonly, proudly, or carelessly to run into it, or continue in it, but carefully to avoid it; for we are to watch against all Sin, if we will be saved. I say, after such hard things spoken of it, I wonder how he could so confidently in the very next words, hence infer, That **therefore it's a false, horrible, and unsufferable Opinion, that all who are guilty of Schism are in a state of Damnation, &c.** (p. 10.) For if there be any Truth in this Conclusion, I am sure it can never flow from these Premisses, but rather the contrary. He might as well have said, that *Murder* and *Adultery* are great Sins, and thence infer that they are not damning. For wherein do they provoke God more than he confesseth the other do? But our business is not to enquire into their Sin, who may be any ways, or in any degree guilty of Schism, in his new notion and various sorts of it, but how great is their Sin, who are guilty of a *formal stated Schism*; and if he speak not to this, his whole Book is one entire Fallacy, and doth not answer, but evade the true Question.

(24.) I do not marvel, that he should be unwilling that any of his Party should believe Schism to be so dangerous a Sin; for it might deter them from it, and spoil their Trade. They are safe enough, while they can make them so proud, scornful, and inconsiderate, as to *despise it as a foolish Charge*, and are buoy'd up with a false persuasion, that it proceeds from *Pride and carnal Interest*; but truly I can look upon it as no other than a piece of uncommon Impudence, when he would persuade them, that *we do not believe our selves*; though in this they shew themselves to be Masters of their Craft, for to gain this point would be no small advantage to their Cause; for if we do not believe our selves, there is no reason in

the world that they should believe us. But tho' I allow of neither their Principles nor Practices, yet I dare not say, that they do not believe themselves, if it were for no other reason, than what the Scripture tells me, That *many shall be given over to strong delusions to believe a lye*. But you see how far their *Moderation* and excess of Charity extends, who would represent us to the World, as such damnable Dissemblers, who do not believe themselves in what they constantly profess and maintain. It is no wonder that we should become despicable and hateful to their fiery Zealots, when they can persuade them to have such an opinion of us. But there is a God, who knows our Sincerity, and will one day impartially judge between us. However, whoever believes, or not believes it, our Author undertakes the Proof of the Thing on his part; and we shall follow him, to see how he makes it good.

C H A P. III.

The Rashness of his Assertion, which he promiseth to prove in four Particulars, §. 1. The Opinion, if it were taken from the Roman Doctors, may be good, 2, 3, 4. That it is not taken from the Roman Doctors, 5. A short Answer to his Authorities, 6.

(1.) **T**HAT the Sin of Schism puts Men into a state of Damnation, Mr. Tallents affirms to be a *false, horrible, and unsufferable Opinion*; and not content with that, which one would think should be bad enough, he moreover undertakes to make it *appear foolish and abominable to all*, (p. 11.) Had he instill'd this Opinion into his Admirers, who
take

take all his *Dictates* for *Oracles*, and kept it as an *Arcanum* amongst the *Party*, it might have work'd *Wonders*, and mightily promoted their *new-fashion'd Moderation*; but in a scornful manner to publish it in Print, I fear will expose his own *Discretion*; not only because it *discovers* a *Secret*, and allarms and *exasperates* his *Opposers*, but also for two other Reasons. 1st, Because by his own Confession this false Opinion is grounded on some Passages in *Cyprian*, and other of the *Fathers*. Now these were Men of eminent Parts, Piety and Learning; and moreover were either Martyrs or Confessors for the Faith; they were never accounted *Fools*, till Mr. *Tallents* put them into the List. And those, who have any Reverence for Antiquity, or Esteem for the best of Men, will be apt to have meaner Thoughts of his *Wisdom*, who so insolently attempts to blast their *Reputation*. 2^{dly}, Mr. *Tallents* himself confesseth *Schism* to be *Sin*; and if so, what better course can be taken to deter and keep Men from it, than to set it forth in the most ill-favoured Colours it will bear? And if he and his Party are free from it, what need they care how monstrously it is exposed? The blame will then fall on their Adversaries, and their Cause will look much the better for it. When therefore a Man needlessly labours to lessen a *Sin*, it is forely to be suspected, that he fears he shall fall under the *Guilt* of it. But to let that pass, seeing he hath so boldly undertaken the Task, I shall be so bold as to examine his Performance. Now, that the Opinion is *horrible, foolish and abominable*, he promiseth to shew from these four Topicks.

1st, That it is greatly taken from the *Romanists*,

2^{dly}, That it is without any ground in *Scripture*, and is fully against it.

3^{dly}, That it damns a great part of the Church, multitudes of excellent Persons in all Ages and Places,

as will be evident by his *short History of Schism.*

4thly. That it's grounded only on *some Passages in Cyprian, and other of the Fathers*; to which, for the sake of some who may be amused, or misled by them, a full Answer (he saith) will be given, first in general, then in particular.

(2.) If the second of these will not help him, (which shall be tried when we come to it) it is obvious to any one at first sight, that the other three are far from making any direct Proof of his Assertion. But we will take them in course, and as he hath set them down: And first, he saith of this horrible, foolish, abominable Opinion, That it is greatly taken from the chief Doctors of the Church of Rome. There is some latent design in the singularity of the Phrase; why is it said to be greatly taken? what is the Meaning of it? Greatly is not altogether; and how shall we know what, or how much of it is meant by this greatly? In his fourth Head of Argument he saith, *It's only grounded on some Passages in Cyprian, and other of the Fathers*: And if only on them, who lived before Popery was known or thought of, how comes it to be greatly taken from the late Roman Doctors? These were laid a little too near together, considering how ill they agree. But you must know, that if we cannot find Popery in every thing, we shall be forc'd upon plain Argument, and then it will go hard with us. And therefore the Cry of Popery must always come in, and is to be used as an Amulet or Charm to raise the Indignation of some People, who are terribly afraid of Popery, while they know not what it is; and by that means to make them deaf to all other Reasoning. And tho' the best of Kings was brought to the Block, and the best of Churches overturn'd and destroy'd by a false Cry of Popery, yet the same Artifice still prevails; and People are kept so warm with the constant

stant noise of it, that they have no Patience to examine the Truth of the Charge, but are hurried away with the vain Fears and Jealousies, which these Men put into their Heads; and so the same Cry still runs down all before it. Whereas, if *Popery* ever come to settle here, we shall be indebted to their *Turbulency, Deceit, and Unreasonableness* for it. The *Boy*, who so often without cause cry'd, *The Wolf, The Wolf*, in the end had so hardned the *Shepherds*, that they would not believe him, when the *Wolf* came indeed.

(3.) But since he undertakes to manifest the Opinion to be *foolish*, I think he hath made choice of a very untoward medium for his purpose in saying it is taken from the *Chief Roman Doctors*. For are their *Chief Doctors* only a pack of Fools? I think it so unworthy a part to attempt to gain any point by false Aspersions and Slander, that I should rather be willing to give even the Devil his due. All ingenuous Men will readily acknowledge, that the *Chief Roman Doctors* may be allowed their Places among the Principal Learned Men of their Time; and I believe it would be a difficult Task for Mr. *Tallents* to find any considerable number amongst his *Presbyterian* or *Independent Doctors* to match them. And if an Opinion must be therefore said to be *foolish*, because taken from the *Chief Roman Doctors*, I know not why any Opinions peculiar to the *Independents* or *Presbyterians* may not as well be said to be Foolish, because taken from their *Chief Doctors*. For tho' I doubt not, but that the *Dissenters* think highly of their own *Wisdom*, yet I think the other have made it appear to the World, that they are as little *Fools* as themselves. It had therefore been more credit to our Author, if he had been more sparing in this kind. I deny not but that a Charge of Ignorance may be too truly drawn up, not only

against many of their *Laity*, but even of their *Clergy*; and I wish it might not be so with others: But their *Chief Doctors*, as they are commonly Men of more than *common Parts*, so I think it might be easily proved, that they have more advantages for Learning than most other Men. Indeed where their Cause will not bear Water, they are very apt to have recourse to Sophistry, and they are excellent at it; and many of them are exercised in a Practice of puzzling Matters, and made to shew their Wits, how they can baffle Truth by an Art they call *Subtilitatem dicendi*. If therefore instead of saying the Opinion, because taken from them, was *foolish*, he had said it might be suspected to be *knaveish*, his Assertion had been more plausible. For he might much more easily have persuaded the World, that they were *Knaves*, than that they were *Fools*. And yet this had been no certain proof: For every thing is not *false* that a *Knave* saith, nor *knaveish* which he doth; he must sometimes practise *Truth* and *Honesty*, or else he will have nothing to colour his *Knavery*.

(4.) This now leads me to another Argument against his Assertion, That supposing the Opinion to be *greatly taken from the Chief Doctors of the Church of Rome*, yet it cannot, *eo nomine*, be said to be either *horrible*, *foolish*, or *abominable*. For the only Reason he urgeth, that it is so, is, That it is taken from them; and if the being taken from them, is that which makes it *horrible*, *foolish*, and *abominable*; then whatsoever may with like reason be said to be taken from them, must be deemed to be *horrible*, *foolish*, and *abominable*: And then, unless we will fall under this heavy Charge, we must *use* nothing they *use*, *do* nothing which they *approve*, nor *believe* any thing which they *believe*. And at this rate, if *Papists* wear *Clotbes*, we must go *naked*; if they enjoin *publick Worship*, we must allow

allow *none*; if they *believe in God*, we must turn *Atheists*; if they *acknowledge the Scriptures*, we must *deny* them; and many other such horrid Consequences, which would make a Man's Hair stare on his Head to hear only mentioned. If he had said, that it was taken from them, as being peculiar to them, and an abuse or false Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, which is properly called *Popery*, he had then said something to the purpose; but this he neither doth say, nor can say as to this particular. And therefore, though for upholding an inveterate Custom of a spiteful Party, this must be said to scandalize the Church of *England*, and Bugbear poor deluded Souls; I cannot but make it a doubt, whether Mr. *Tallents*, though he was resolved to make a flourish with it, could really persuade himself, that the Argument was of any force to prove an Opinion to be no less than *horrible*, *foolish*, and *abominable*, meerly for being *greatly taken from the Chief Doctors of the Church of Rome*. Other Truths, acknowledged not only by us, but by the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* themselves may with more Reason be said to be taken from them than this. For it is agreed, that there are many Truths, which are acknowledged by them, and are no less owned by us all; and if any Man will say, that they were taken from them, I cannot help it; but that shall never persuade me to disown them: But for this, it is at best questionable, whether with any colour of Reason it can be said to be taken from them, which I shall now make appear.

(5.) I think it hath been sufficiently proved, That an Opinion ought not to be called *horrible*, *foolish*, and *abominable*, purely upon the account that it is said to be *greatly taken from the Chief Doctors of the Roman Church*. And if the Argument in it self be not good, tho' it were never so true; if it more-
over

over be proved to be false, and that it was not taken from them, I think it may be said to be very impertinently and imprudently made use of in this case; and if it farther appear to be so from Mr. *Tallents's* own Reasoning upon this very head, it certainly may be thought very unbecoming his Years and Learning thus to trifle with the World, and endeavour to impose upon Men. Now, by its being taken from the *Romish Doctors*, he must mean either that our Notion of *Schism*, or the Opinion that *Schism* is as heinous a Sin as *Murder* or *Adultery* is taken thence, or both. But neither of these is true. For, *first*, our Notion of *Schism* is not the same with theirs; ours is as ancient as the Church of Christ, and the same with the primitive Fathers: Theirs is later, and crept in with the exorbitant Power of the Pope, and is owned by no Christians in the World but those of their own Communion. We acknowledge every true and lawful Bishop to be the Head of Unity, and Representative of Christ within his District, and that *Schism* ariseth by departing from and setting up against such lawful Authority; but we own no one Head of the Universal Church but Christ Jesus himself: They are for one Universal Vicarial Head by divine Appointment fix'd to the See of *Rome*, to whom all *Bishops* in the World must be *Underlings* and *Slaves*, and without whose Direction or Allowance they must not dare to Act; which as it can never be proved, so is it intolerable and impracticable. But I need not farther insist on this, because thus far our Accuser himself acquits us. For thus saith he, *They (i.e. the Romanists) say none are in the Church, but they that own the Pope, and communicate with the Church of Rome. But the Church of England is far from any such abominable Thought: And few, if any of our great Men, incline to the Papists in this, though several join with them*

them in the damning of Schismaticks, (p. 13.) It remains therefore to enquire concerning the Opinion, *That Schism is as great a Sin as Murther or Adultery*, whether we have taken it from the *Roman Doctors*? And if we have not, then there is no truth, as well as no force in his Argument. He might have spared his pains in proving, That the *Papists* are of this Opinion; for I shall readily grant it. But then Mr. *Tallents* did not so well consult the Interest of his Cause, when at the same time he tells us, and brings his proofs for it, That the *Roman Doctors* have taken this Opinion from the *Fathers*; and he particularly names *Clemens, Cyprian, Optatus, Augustin*. Indeed he cannot find a *Saint* amongst them, though the meanest of his Tribe shall be honoured with the Title. In short, he saith as to *Baronius*, That he observes, that *Chrysostom and Hierom have said the same, and all the Fathers of the Church*, (p. 12.) A jolly Company. Now why might not we take this Opinion from the *Fathers*, as well as the *Romanists*? Are we more debarred from the *Fathers* than they? Is there an *Inquisition*, or any *Deleaturs*, upon the *Fathers* among us, as there is among them? Or are the *Fathers* neglected, and not read by us? I thank God, as poor and mean as I am, I have by me a good parcel of the *Fathers*, and I think can read them as well as some others; and I should think my self very unadvised, if I should have recourse to the *Romanists* for that, which I could much better have from the *Fathers themselves*. Would any Man, who hath his Senses, leave the pure clear Fountain, to drink at a fulsom muddy Stream? When we have it in our choice, why should it be thought, that we would take an Opinion from those, who in all other Matters would be a shame and reproach to us, when we might as easily have it from them, who were the Glory of the

the *Christian Church*, and would be an *Honour* and *Reputation* to us? It would tempt one to think, that Mr. *Tallents* had condemned the Opinion as *foolish*, with a design to beg us all for *Fools*. Why could he not be as civil to *us*, as he is to the *Romanists*, and allow us to have taken the Opinion from the *Fathers*, as well as acknowledge that the *Roman Doctors* have done so? But perhaps there is a considerable Reason for this, which though Mr. *Tallents* thought fit to keep as a Secret, yet I am resolv'd to blab it out. To have said, that we had taken it from the *Fathers*, would have been no scandal to us, nor have excited the Scorn and Indignation of his Party against us, but might have endangered the giving some Credit to the Opinion; and therefore, right or wrong, true or false, we are to be charged with taking it from the *Roman Doctors*; for otherwise his Party could not be alarm'd, nor we made obnoxious to the Hatred and Violence of *Legion*. This is neither very ingenious, nor honest. And I will farther give him a Reason, why he ought and might more properly have said, that we took this Opinion from the *Fathers*, than that the *Romanists* have done so. For we urge this against *Schism* in that Sense and Notion which the *Fathers* themselves had of *Schism*; but the *Romanists* urge this against *Schism* in their Novel and Peculiar Notion of it. So that let both the Truth of the Opinion, and the Application of it be considered, it is *we* that have taken it from the *Fathers*, and not the *Romanists*; for as they apply it, theirs is not the Opinion of the *Fathers*, but ours is.

(6.) As for the Nature and Danger of the Sin of Schism, it will be more properly considered in another place; here I am only concerned with our Author's Reasoning: And from what hath been said, I think it doth plainly appear, that his Assertion

sertion is not true ; and though it were true, yet it is of no force in this case, as not proving what he brings it for ; and so his first Argument is good for nothing : And I need not follow him after all those Authors, which he brings to prove what we do not deny. But because he names one or two, who speak more favourably of Persons involv'd in Schism, I shall return him only this short Answer : That God hath bound us up to the Rules and Laws he hath given us, but hath not limited himself, as to the Dispensation of his Mercies and Favours, out of the common and ordinary way. How far therefore God may be pleased to extend his Mercy to Persons misled into Schism, who are purely under mistake, and otherwise sober and modest, and willing to come to the knowledge of the Truth, it becomes neither me nor any other to determine, whatever we may hope or wish ; this is wholly in the good Pleasure of the Almighty : And though Pity and Compassion may move us to hope and say what is most favourable and kind, yet here we have no certain Rule to walk by ; nor is it safe for them to trust to such uncertain Charitable Supposals. And therefore this I do say, and will stand by, till I shall be convinced of the contrary, That they are out of the Ordinary Way ; and that is the Rule, according to which we ought to make our *Judgment*, which way soever our *Affections* may work.

C H A P. IV.

The Opinion, that Schism is as great a Sin as Murder or Adultery, prov'd to be not against Scripture, §. 1. Objections answered, 2. The Text, 1 Cor. 13. 1, 2, 3. explain'd and vindicated, 3. Two Texts in St. Luke reconciled, and their meaning set forth, 4. Dr. Sherlock vindicated, 5. What Agreement necessary, 6. Separation from the Authority of the Church, separation from the Church, 7. The Citations from Mr. Hooker and Dr. Stillingfleet considered, 8. His Argument retorted, 9. Mr. Dodwell defended, 10, 11. That Schism destroys Charity, 12. The Author's mother-mistake confuted, 13.

(1.) **T**HE Noise of Popery was the Forerunner to sound to Arms, and rouse the Party; but that proving a *false Cry*, he next endeavours to shelter himself under the *Authority in Scripture*, to which we are as ready to submit as any Men whatsoever; but first desire to know, whether it be so or no. For the greater the Authority, the more dangerous a false Pretence of it. Now his second Argument he lays down in these words: *This Horrid Opinion has no ground in Scripture, but is full against it, (p. 19.)* If it have no ground in Scripture, I ought not to desire him to shew, what is not; but if it be full against Scripture, I think he is obliged to prove that very clearly; otherwise he will be much to blame for drawing up such a horrible Charge: But this I cannot find that he hath done, or any where to purpose set about it. But if I do prove, that this Opinion, let him call it as *horrid* as he pleaseth, hath ground in Scripture, then the Consequence will be, that it is not against it; and then their cry of *Scripture, Scripture,*

Scripture, will be much to the same purpose as that of the Jews, *The Temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord*, even while they profaned it. That *Schism* is a *Sin*, Mr. *Tallents* not only confesseth, but proves from *Scripture*; but he has a great mind to make it an odd sort of an *insignificant Sin*. The fear of *Popery* perhaps hath scared him from taking up the distinction of *mortal* and *venial Sin*; and yet he would have it as like this latter as one Egg is to another. For the sake of the *Dissenters*, it must be accounted such a pretty *harmless Sin*, that it is not worth while to charge any Men with it, or to discourage them from it. But it seems there are other Men, who are not of his mind; and therefore the question must be, Whether *Schism* be as great a *Sin* as *Murder* or *Adultery*? Now suppose, that in this particular the *Scripture* hath made no distinct Comparison between these Sins, nor said which is the greater; must we therefore never judge of the greatness or heinousness of any Sin, with respect to others, unless the *Scripture* have gone before us in that matter, compared them together, and determined the Case? May we not judge of a Sin by its Nature, by its mischievous Effects, and the like, without being said to judge against *Scripture*? And when *Scripture* not only condemns a thing as a *Sin*, but represents it as *foul* and *abominable*, and passionately deters from it, (as it doth in the case of *Schism*) may not this be some ground for our proceedings? The *Scripture* exposeth *Schism* as a great Sin, and among his many sorts Mr. *Tallents* hath found out one sort of *Schism*, which he confesseth to be worse than *Murder* or *Adultery*, (p. 9.) and I hope he of all Men living would not do this, unless he had some ground from *Scripture*; and therefore by his own Confession it cannot be universally true, That this *horrid Opinion* (as he will call it) is *full against*
Scripture,

Scripture, and hath no ground in it. This the force of Truth drew from him: But for the sake of his Cause he must either distinguish it off, or directly unsay it again; and how he behaves himself under that Circumstance shall be now enquired into.

(2.) When he had told us, that *this Opinion hath no ground in Scripture, but is full against it.* I did expect to have found such plain convincing Texts produced, as should have put an end to the Controversie. For if it be thus full against Scripture, that might have been easily done; and as it would have been the readiest way, so also the most satisfactory. But Saying and Proving are two things; and some Men had rather you should take twenty things upon their bare word, than put them upon the proof of one. This would have been an uneasie task; and therefore he takes another course, and endeavours to invalidate some particular Texts and Reasons, which are urg'd by his Adversaries. Now when a Man shall pick and choose, and represent his Antagonist as he list, he may, if he have any Brains, make his own business easie; but such skimming over a Controversie will never bring it to a Head and Determination. However, we must follow him in the way he will go: And the first Text he would wrest from them is, 1 Cor. 13. 1, 2, 3. *Though I speak with the Tongues of Men and Angels, and have not Charity, I am become as sounding Brass, or a tinkling Cymbal. And though I have the Gift of Prophecy, and understand all Mysteries, and all Knowledge: and though I have all Faith, so that I could remove Mountains, and have no Charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my Goods to feed the Poor, and though I give my Body to be burnt, and have not Charity, it profiteth me nothing.* He truly calls these *awakening Words*, and I heartily wish they might thoroughly awaken
both

both him and his Party. For if these words are spoken upon a Supposition, that those who are the Causes of *Rents* and *Schisms* cannot be endued with true *Christian Charity*; and that therefore their *Sin* is such, that neither *miraculous Gifts*, nor the *greatest Knowledge*, nor the most *compassionate Relief* of the *Poor*, no, nor even *Faith* nor *Martyrdom* it self, can stand them in any stead, I think this will plainly appear to be some ground to censure such a *Sin*, as being as great as either *Murder* or *Adultery*. And that this is the Sense of this Text, I think may be easily made evident; but first I must see what he hath to say to the contrary. And he very unadvisedly begins with themselves: *If (saith he) a Dissenter, whatever his appearance in Religion be, have not this Charity, he is nothing, he will be undone for ever.* Have a care, lest you burn more than your Fingers. The very purport of this Text is to prove, that such a Person cannot have *this Charity*. Nor have you any other way to avoid it, but by shewing the unlawfulness of the *Authority* and *Communion* your *Dissenters* have departed from, which I am confident they can never do; and as for any *Occasional Conformist*, he ought not so much as pretend to it. For if the *Authority* and *Communion* be unlawful, it can never be lawful to join in it. This, I think, is to mend the matter Tinkerwise, and not to make their Case better, but worse. After this slight touch at the Dissenters, he falls foul upon all manner of Conformists: *If (saith he) one that's zealous for the Church by Law established, and communicates with no other at any time, have not this Charity, &c.*—And all *Rulers and Churches*, that impose *sinful, doubtful or needless things, &c.* if they have not this *Charity*;—and they that write concerning *Schism*, and damn those that differ from them, if they have not this *Charity*; all these (saith he)

are nothing, but will be undone for ever, (p. 20.) Now supposing all this be true, what is it to the purpose? Is this any proof, that this Text is not levelled against *Schism*? But it matters not whether it make any proof or not, so long as it serves another design, which is to represent all Persons, who think or speak any thing hardly of *Dissenters*, as Men void of *Christian Charity*, and consequently in a *damnable Condition*; if you do not speak all soft and kind things of them, you must be undone for ever, i. e. *damn'd*: A very proper Specimen of *Dissenters Moderation* and *Charity* both! But he is mistaken in his *Charity*: For it is not *Charity*, but at the best no better than supine *Negligence*, *Cowardice* and *Folly* to *sooth* Men up in their *Sins*, and *encourage* them in an *evil Way*, which tends to their *utter Ruine*: In this case it is rather *Charity* to warn them of their *Sin* and *Danger*, and where *Compassion* prevails not, to pull them out of the *Fire*, if it be possible; to expose their *Sin*, so as to make them sensible of it, is the greatest *Charity* in this case that can be to their Persons, by endeavouring to reclaim them from it. But I need not pursue this any farther; for in the very next words he confesseth, That it is not to the purpose, for which we alledge it. And therefore he proceeds thus: *Many who are void of this Charity, nay and hate their Brethren, may live quietly in a Church, &c.* (p. 20.) I fear they will not live very quietly, or not very long so, who hate their Brethren. But we may give him that; this being as little to the purpose as the other. For did we ever say, That there is no *Sin* inconsistent with *Charity* but *Schism*? Or doth what he says prove, that *Schism* and *Charity* are very consistent, and that this Text doth not prove the contrary? He takes great pains to reconcile *Charity* with *Schism*, and at the same time grants

Cyprian to be against him. For he tells us, That *He* (i. e. *St. Cyprian*) *presses this, but overstrains it; as some good Men after him have done; but he did not prove, as he ought, that none can have true Charity, who separate from a true Church.* He must either not have read *St. Cyprian*, or read him with a strange Prejudice, who saith this of him. For I do not know any of the Fathers that more fully proves it, or more frequently urgeth this very Text to this purpose, as will be evident to any, who will consult his Epistle *ad Iubajanum*, and his Book *de Unitate Ecclesie, de bono Patientie, & de Zelo & Livore.* In all which places this Text is brought to prove, that Violaters of *Unity* have not this *Charity.* And who are *Violaters of Unity*, if *Schismatics* be not? Nay, *Mr. Tallents* himself lays this down as an undoubted Truth, That *the Life of Schism lies in Uncharitableness, and the Venom of it in Hatred,* (p. 8.) Now when by his own Confession the Crime in its own nature, is so opposite to Charity, that it cannot have Life or Being but by the extinction of Charity, how is it possible to free the Criminal, and to make him a charitable Person, whose Sin extinguisheth Charity in him?

(3.) Having given Answer to his several Objections, which indeed are strangely loose and wide from the purpose, I shall, though as briefly as may be, endeavour somewhat farther to clear the Meaning of this Text; and so to shew, that it hath been very pertinently used by others in this case. *Corinth*, the Metropolis of *Achaia*, was a City of great Trade, rich and populous; and *Wealth* is very apt to make People think themselves *wise*; and on that account to start new Opinions, and be tenacious of them, which consequently breeds Feuds and Disturbances. Thither also flock'd many *Jews*, a Mercurial People, for the benefit of Trade, who

were implacable Enemies to *St. Paul*, and the Christian Religion: And even such of the converted *Jews*, as continued zealous of the Law, always hotly opposed them. And amongst this medley of People pernicious Doctrines were set on foot, even to the denial of the *Resurrection of the Dead*; than which nothing could be more destructive of Christianity. In this case it was no easie matter to preserve the Faith uncorrupt, and to keep Peace and Love among the Professors of it. Now because the want of these did not only hinder the Propagation of the Christian Religion, but endanger the very Being of it, *St. Paul* sets himself with strong and manifold Arguments to persuade to Peace, Love and Unity, and to convince them of the necessity of it. But I shall wave them all, to consider only That in the preceding Chapter, upon which this Text follows as a farther and still more pressing Argument. There he informs us, that all *Christians* are *Members* of one *Body*, whereof *Christ* is the *Head*; and that their Safety consists not only in their continuing *Members*, but by discharging their respective *Duties*, which are requisite for the Relief, Maintenance, and Support of the *Body*; and this he illustrates by a Similitude taken from the Natural Body, wherein all the several Members have their distinct Uses and Employments; and as no Member ought to invade the Office of another, so neither can it neglect its own Duty without detriment or danger both to it self and the whole; and though some of their Offices may seem mean, yet the meanest of them are so necessary, that not any one can say it stands not in need of the other; *The Eye cannot say unto the Hand, I have no need of thee: nor again, the Head to the Feet, I have no need of you,* (ver. 21.) But if the *Hand* should thrust the *Eye* out of its Office, and take upon it self the discharge of it, there would be blind doings;

ings; and if the *Feet* should usurp the Office of the *Head*, and set us to walk on our *Heads* with our *Heels* uppermost, the whole *Body* must needs be monstrously uneasie; nor could it at this rate be of long continuance. The comfort and safety of each part, and of the whole, consists in the mutual discharge of those Offices for which Nature designed them; but if any part acts crossgrain'dly, it disorders and grieves the whole; and if it separate from the *Body*, it maims the *Body*, and cuts it self off from any communication with, or supply from the *Body*, without which it cannot live. And thus in the Church, which is the *Body* of Christ, (of which we must all be Members, if we will receive any saving Influence from him) *there are diversities of Gifts, Administrations, and Operations*: But then these *are given to profit withal*; and therefore they ought not to be so used, as to cross and to interfere with one another; nor ought any, leaving his own Function, invade another's: But every Christian in his proper station ought to act in Love and mutual Agreement, for the comfort and benefit of the whole: *That there should be no Schism in the Body; but that the Members should have the same care one for another.* And if there ought to be no *Schism* or *Division* in the *Body*, certainly there ought to be no *Separation* from it; for that is still much worse, at least for the Party separating. And thus the Apostle having shewed the necessity of *Union* with respect to the good and safety of the whole *Body*, he comes in the next place to shew the necessity of it with respect to every particular *Member*, that those, who perhaps might be less careful of it in respect of the whole, might become more careful of it upon the account of their own safety: And this he doth in the words of this very Text, wherewith our Author strives to pick a quarrel. *Though I speak with the Tongues of*

Men and Angels, and have not Charity, I am become as sounding Brass, or a tinkling Cymbal, &c. which though spoken in his own Person, yet is designed to let them know, that if they were refractory, disorderly, and made divisions in, or rents from the Church, let their Gifts or Qualifications be never so great or extraordinary, they were destitute of that Charity, which was necessary for every Christian, which could be entituled to the Mercies of God in Christ Jesus; and that for want of that, all their other Accomplishments should *profit them nothing*. And thus I think it is here plainly the meaning of the Apostle; that *Schism*, whether in or out of the Church, is inconsistent with true *Christian Charity*; and therefore since Scripture is always agreeing with it self, this Text alone, if we had no other, were sufficient to overthrow his Assertion.

(4.) The other Text which he produceth, is that Saying of our Saviour, *Luke 11. 23. He that is not with me, is against me; and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad.* And as if this were all the Texts that are produced against Schism, he sets down no more; as if his Adversaries had no farther pretension to Scripture in the case, though he could not but know in his Conscience that many more are urged by them, and perhaps more home and pertinently. However, he confesseth this to be *true*; and indeed I did not expect that he should be so hardy as to deny Scripture: But then he endeavours to shew, that it is not pleadable against Schism by committing it together by the Ears with another Text; *Luke 9. 49, 50. John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out Devils in thy Name, and we forbad him, because he followeth not with us. Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not; for he that is not against us, is for us.* There is no Contradiction in these Texts; for he that is not
against

against you, may be for you; and yet he that is not with you, may be against you, according as the Matter and Cause requires, as will appear in these two cases. For though the Man, that was casting out Devils, did not at present actually follow with them, yet in that very Action he shewed his great Opinion of the Power of Christ, and his inclination towards him, and his desire to do good; which is nothing like being against him: And our Saviour himself in the other Evangelist gives a Reason why this Man could not be against him. (Mark 9. 39.) *For (saith he) there is no Man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me.* Here was no opposition or gathering from Christ, but rather gathering towards him: But in the other Text, where he saith, *He that is not with me, is against me, &c.* His Speech is directed to the *Pharisees* and their *Partisans*, who whilst they pretended to a sort of Neutrality were really against Christ. Now these Men were bound to know the Law, and they were Interpreters of it to others; and therefore when our Saviour came, and shewed all the Evidences of his being the *promised Messias*, they of all others ought first to have joined themselves to him, and acknowledged and preach'd him to others; and when he apparently set himself to destroy the Kingdom of Satan, it was their duty to do also their part with him; there could be no room for being *Neuters* between God and the Devil. But instead of this, they opposed him, spake blasphemously against him, and said, *He cast out Devils by Belzebub the Prince of the Devils.* Now this was taking the Devil's part, and gathering for him, and scattering abroad from Christ; and therefore notwithstanding their pretended Neutrality in not being with him, they were against him. Now though this Text seems on this occasion to be mostly directed

sected against Unbelief, Obstinacy and Hypocrisie; yet these words [*He that gathereth not with me, scattereth*] being general, they must farther condemn any *Sin*, which doth not gather with him but scatter. And therefore if Schism does not gather into Christ's Fold, but scatter his Sheep from him, then *Schism* must be condemned by this very Text: And if dividing People in their Judgments and Affections; if withdrawing Persons from their Obedience to the Authority *Christ* hath left, and setting up Authorities of their own against it; if using all Arts to make them irreconcilable with each other, be not scattering, and not gathering, I must confess I know not what those words mean. But of *Schism* I intend a fuller Account hereafter.

(5.) He hath quickly done with the Scriptures produced by others; for he names only two: I thought after these I might have found no small numbers of Texts of Scripture brought on his own part to have made good his Assertion; but instead of that he falls to examine other Men's *Reasons*, which is just nothing to the purpose. For his business here was to prove this Opinion to be full against Scripture, let other Men's *Reasons* be what they will. But though he is beside the Cushion, I will try how well he manages it. And first Dr. Sberlock is brought on the Stage, who (if he cites him true) did say, That all that separate from any true particular Church, without a just cause, separate from the whole Catholick Church. And again, That all who separate from any sound part of the Catholick Church, are broke off from the whole Catholick Church, and have forfeited their Interest in the Covenant of Grace, and have no right to the Blessings of it. It is no marvel, that Men should be offended at this Doctrine, who take it for granted, that they commenc'd Saints from the time

time that they became *Schismaticks*. For this will *Unfaint* them again, and therefore is not to be endured. And therefore to be even with him, our Author saith, *This is contrary to the plainest Truth, and the avow'd Judgment of the most eminent Divines*, (p. 21, 22.) and truly this is lustily said, if we do not come poorly off with the proof of it. To this purpose he alledgeth, *That all that profess one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, are Members of Christ's visible Church; and this being divided into several Parts or Churches, in divers Nations and Places, is One.* And with this he ought to remember, that *Baptism* is the Initiation or Admission into the *Church*: And I would willingly know, how a Man can be a Member of the *visible Church*, and yet be joined to no *part* of it? Can a *Member* be joined to the *Body* all over, and to no *part* of it? Or can a *Member* be joined to the *Body* any other way than by being joined to some *part* of it? Can the *Foot* be joined to the *Body*, without being joined to the *Leg*? Or indeed can it be joined to the *Body* any other way but by being joined to the *Leg*? For by reason of their Office, there is a necessity that some Members be joined immediately to some certain Members, and not to others. For if you should joyn the *Foot* to any other part than the *Leg*, it would either cease to be a *Foot*, or not do its office, but make the *Body* monstrous: And thus in the Church or Body of Christ, Christians are united to it by being Members of some particular Church, or part of it. For how can they be joined to it, who adhere to no part of it? And moreover, they ought also to do their Duties in their respective Places and Stations; otherwise Disorder and Confusion must necessarily arise.

(6.) As to the Church being one with respect to its Members, he farther tells us, *That it is not by being of one Opinion or Way in all things, for they*
of

oft differ in many lesser things. And so let them: What is this to the purpose? Who ever required or expected, that all Men should agree in every thing? You may as well hope to see all Faces alike, or all Men of the same *size* and *stature*, as all in every thing of the same *Opinion*. But then must they agree in nothing? Or doth this give them a License to despise their Superiors, or disobey their lawful Commands? He told us before, *that Order was as necessary in a Church as in an Army.* Now in an Army every private Centinel may be of a particular Opinion; but not one of them is suffer'd to disobey the Command of his Captain, or any other Superior Officer, so far as his Commission extends. But if he run away from his Colours, he renounceth his Right to his being of that Company; (though if they catch him, they will let him know what he ought to be) and if he be disbanded, he is no longer a member of it. There is not such a coercive Power in the Church as in an Army; but the necessity of Order is *greater* in the Church than in an Army; for in the one it is upon the account of *temporal Safety*, in the other *our eternal Safety* calls on us for it. And as for such disorderly Persons, who either depart from the Society of themselves, or are justly by lawful Authority excluded from it, I apprehend not how they can be still said to be Members of it. The Judgment of the Primitive Church, wherein they were universally agreed, is certainly not to be despised; and according to their Discipline, he that was excommunicated from one Church, was thereby excommunicated from all others; his Cause indeed might be examined and enquired into by others, but if his Excommunication was found just, it held good all over the Christian World.

(7.) He pretends to prove, that *Separation from a true Church, upon the account of lesser things, is*
not

not Separation from the whole Catholick Church; because they separate not from it in the main things, wherein the Being and Unity of the Church lies, but are therein fully one with it. Now the Church is a Corporation or Society; and can there be a Society without Government? Is not an authoritative and regulating Power necessary to the very Being of it? And if a Man, who well enough approves of some things in the Society, yet is dissatisfied in others, and desires the Rules of the Society to be altered; and not being gratified in his peevish demands, renounceth and denies the Authority of the Society; and upon that account either departs from it, or is spew'd out by it, he is no longer a Member of that Society, notwithstanding what he may approve in it. So it is here, if a Person separate from the Church, he may hold the Faith, wherein they agree, as a *Man*, but not as a *Member* of the Church; and so it shall do him no good. For the *Devils believe and tremble*, (James 2. 19.) The Promises of God are made to Christians, not as separate single Men, but as Members of Christ's Body; and unless you be Members of that Body, his gracious Influence will not be communicated to you.

(8.) But having said, that the most eminent Divines were on his side, that he might make some shew of proof of it, he cites two, *Hooker* and *Stillingsfleet*; for so he plainly calls them. These indeed are very eminent Divines, and of great Authority; yet *amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, sed magis amica Veritas*. Mr. *Hooker* indeed, upon the account of the name *Christian*, doth suppose that all, who acknowledge one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, are in some sort (not fully, as our Author will have it) part of the visible Church. But then in the same place he tells us, that for all that they may at the same time be *Imps and Limbs*

Limbs of Satan, and Tares among the Wheat. And if it be such a Membership, which our Author contends for, I fear his Brethren will give him small thanks for it. The same learned Person farther to explain himself, distinguisheth between the *Visible* and *Mystical* or *invisible Church*. And to make a Man a Member of the *Mystical Church*, (of which is only the sound part of the *Visible Church*, which is not discernable by Sense, and to which only Salvation appertains) he grants that such an external mark, as the acknowledgment of *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*, is not sufficient without other Qualifications. And therefore such a Membership alone is scarce worth pleading for, because alone and separate from other necessary Qualifications, it will not stand us in much stead; for Men may be damn'd for all that. But then it may be farther enquired, Whether, notwithstanding such an acknowledgment, Men may not depart from the Church, as it is a Body or Society, or be excluded from it? Mr. Hooker indeed seems to own them, whether they be *Heretics*, or otherwise *wicked Men*, to be *part of the Visible Church*, while they make such acknowledgment; but to anticipate an Argument, that their own Separation from the Society might dismember them, he asserts that even Excommunication doth not effect this, and that *it neither shutteth out from the Mystical, nor clean from the Visible (Church), but only from fellowship with the Visible in holy Duties*; i. e. from external Communion: A small Punishment on those, who perhaps are more willing to relinquish it, than the other to thrust them from it. But since our Blessed Saviour saith, *Whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven*, (Mat. 18. 18.) Since Excommunication in the Language of St. Paul, is *a delivering to Satan*, (1 Cor. 5. 5. 1 Tim. 1. 20.) Since in the apprehension

sion of the Primitive Christians (as *Tertullian* expresses their Sense) it was *Summum futuri judicii prejudicium*, I leave it to the Judgment of indifferent Persons, whether it amount not to more than a bare *bar from external Communion*? For it is not without reluctancy that I am forc'd to differ from so great a Man. The learned *Dr. Scillingfleet* seems to have taken this Notion, at least in part, from *Mr. Hooker*; but in that place, whether our Author directs us, there is nothing of it. For there he only proves against the *Romanists*, that though a *Particular Church* may be said to be *Catholick*, yet it is not causally, but by way of communion and participation with the *Catholick Church*; which will make nothing for our Author, but rather against him. But perhaps there might be a *Typographical Error* in the Figure or Mark: For about three Paragraphs farther, there is something capable of being strained this way. For there he makes it his business to prove, that *Separation from any particular Church or Churches, upon the account of Corruptions and Abuses, is not a Separation from the Catholick Church*: Though in the same place he disallows of *Separation from a Church, wherein are Corruptions, if they be not made Conditions of Communion*. But here it is to be considered, that the Doctor is disputing against the Church of *Rome*, which was the cause of the Breach, and in defence of the Church of *England*, which was a *Sister Church*, and had Authority to reform any Abuses or Corruptions crept into her *Doctrine or Worship* without a *Licence from Rome*; and if *Rome* for some time had unlawfully usurp'd an Authority over her, she lawfully might and perhaps ought to resume her own just Rights; so here was no wrong done. But when we speak of *Dissenters* in relation to the Church of *England*, it is of Persons causelessly separating from a true Member of the *Catholick Church*,

Church, in which many of them were baptized, and to which all of them owe a duty, as being both a sound and the established Church, where they live and abide, from which they cannot separate without Scandal, and the violation of just Obligations. And if any one shall please to read Dr. *Scillingfleet's* Treatise of the *Unreasonableness of Separation*, which was written in defence of his Sermon at St. Paul's, he may quickly be satisfied, That the Case between the *Dissenters* and the Church of *England* is quite another thing from the Case between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*, and that that Learned Person thought so.

(9.) In his next Section he boldly asserts, that this Opinion is *against the strain of the holy Scripture*, (p. 23.) But I should have been ashamed to have brought no better proof of it, than an Instance of some Persons, who had some Squabbles among themselves, whilst they continued in the same Communion: For all he there saith amounts to no more, and so is a just Reproach to the *Dissenters* for their *Separation*.

(10.) I make no doubt, but that he thought he had run us all down with the Reputation of his *Two Eminent Divines*; but though I honour the Memory of their Persons, and acknowledge their Eminency, yet I think I have proved, that they have done him small service; and I think it a daring attempt to draw in Mr. *Hooker*, when dead, to side with that Party, by whom he was most maliciously teaz'd all his Life-time, and whom he to the last resolutely opposed. However he hath let us know, that all the *eminent Persons* are not on his side; for unhappily as Eminent a Scholar as either of them stood so full in his way, that he could not forbear taking notice of him, though he had done more advisedly to let him alone. For
he

he will needs persuade us, that Mr. *Dodwell* saw something extraordinary, which made him forbear defining *Schism*, as many do; and lay down his new Notion of *Schism*, as this Author is pleased to call it. This would tempt one to think, that either he had never read that Dissertation, or thought that no body else would; and so he might safely say what he pleased. For it is St. *Cyprian's* Notion of *Schism* which Mr. *Dodwell* there lays down, though I deny not but that he may be said to make it his own by his so learned and elaborate Defence of it. But let the Notion be whose it will, Men so addicted to *Novelties* ought not to be so forward in reproaching any thing as *new*; and it might have become him to have forbore that scornful Term, seeing there is so little reason for it. For that Notion is not less than fourteen hundred Years old, if it were no older than St. *Cyprian's* time; but Mr. *Dodwell* in that same Dissertation carries it as high as to the time of *Ignatius*, second Bishop of *Antioch*, the Contemporary of *Polycarp* the Disciple of St. *John* the blessed Apostle and Evangelist; which bids fair to prove it as old as the calling in of the Gentiles, and the formation of Organical Churches. Nay, he still goes farther, and I think as far as can be desired; for having accurately shewn the true Use to be made of Symbolical Scripture, and proved that many things relating to the Christian Church were not revealed to the Apostles in Christ's Life-time; because (as our Saviour saith, *John* 16. 12.) *they could not bear them yet*; and that many things spoken to them, were not understood by them; nor indeed to be thoroughly understood by them, till the Holy Ghost should be sent, who should bring all things to their remembrance, (*John* 14. 26.) and make them rightly understand them: He then proves from those early Sayings and Predictions of
our

our Saviour, that at the coming in of the Gentiles the Christian Churches should be set on such Foundations, from whence this Notion of Schism must necessarily follow. Now how much older would he have such a Notion? And yet this is that which must be called *a new Notion of Schism*, and which is maintained throughout that whole Dissertation. I verily believe, that Mr. Tallents and his Party have so few such new Notions distinct from those from whom they separate, that (to use the Countryman's Phrase) he would give the best Horse in his Team, that he could produce half so good old Authorities to vouch for the Soundness of either his *Presbyterians* or *Independents* new Notions of Schism, or of any thing else peculiar to them.

(II.) Though he doth not *in terminis* give us St. Cyprian's or Mr. Dodwell's definition of *Schism*, yet he doth not much vary from his Sense, when he tells us, that according to him, *Schism lies in People's leaving their Bishop, on any cause whatsoever, unless the Bishops turn Hereticks or Idolaters, or separate from their fellow Bishops*, (p. 24.) And how doth he prove this Notion *new*? Hold there: That might have given him some trouble; and he hath a trick worth two of it, and strikes it dead at a blow. *The Extravagance of that Opinion* (saith he) *destroys it self*. And thus it is condemn'd for a *Felo de se*, not to have so much as Christian Burial. Behold what Feats a Man of Authority can do! But let him think himself as great as he will, and as meanly as he pleaseth of others, unless he had brought better Reasons, no sober Man for his disdainful Saying will conclude the Opinion either to be *extravagant*, or that it *destroys it self*: It is an Argument of extreme Haughtiness and Self-conceit, thus despicably to treat a Person, who hath scarce his Equal in Europe for all sorts of Learning, and is no less Eminent for exemplary Piety.

Piety. But if *Living Mr. Dodwell* had been made his Scorn and Contempt : For,

*Virtutem presentem odimus
Sublatam ex oculis quarimus invidi.*

Yet he ought to have had a greater regard to those ancient Fathers, and all the Churches of their times, who unanimously embraced, approved, and put in practice this Opinion, than to represent them as so Senseless in themselves, and so Careless of the Peace of the Church, as to set up and walk according to an Opinion, whose *Extravagance destroy'd it self*. But since he advanceth himself above them all, I shall be so bold as to enquire, whether the Hero hath confirmed his severe Censure with answerable Arguments?

(12.) If magisterial Dictates may pass for just Reasonings, he can never be at a loss; and thus he tells us, *That to say all that are guilty of Schism are void of true Spiritual Love, and in a state of Damnation, hath great tendency to destroy Christian Love, and is therefore false.* But if a Man should argue the contrary way, and say, *That Schism hath more than a tendency to destroy Christian Love, because it doth it actually, and therefore the Saying is true;* it looks like better Reasoning. For Hatred, Contention, Variance, perpetual Broils, and fierce Opposition of each other, are the natural effects of Schism; and if these destroy not Christian Love, I desire to know what doth? Most other Sins are *transient Acts*, but Schism is a *continuance* in the same thing, a constant holding course of Sin without interruption; and upon that account must needs be more destructive of Christian Charity, than many other Sins. We never affirmed, that every different apprehension or petty jars amongst Men of the same Communion, made them Schismatics; if he calls this *Schism*, as he seems to do,

F

then

then he, who is so favourable to Schism, makes more Schisms than we do: But then it will be nothing to the purpose, because not to the matter in controversie; for our business is not with such, but with *separating Dissenters*. When he is in the humour, he can allow *Schism* to be a *Sin*, and every *Sin* to be *damnable*: But when he comes to plead his Cause, he endeavours to find out such a Schism, as if it be a Sin, yet shall be a very harmless one, and consistent with true Charity; and then, though it nothing belongs to them, yet it must be apply'd to those, who actually make the breach, and tear Christ's seamless Coat into Rags and Tatters; and then you have nothing to accuse them of, but must declare them to be full of Love: And if you can but thus learn to call Good evil, and Evil good, all shall be well, all Fends at an end, and all Quarrels cease, — until we begin again. But he thinks he presseth this farther, when he tells us, That *Christ our Lord never taught any thing to destroy that heavenly Grace, which he so greatly presses every where*. There can be no doubt of it; and therefore also, that he never taught us to raise irreconcilable Quarrels in or against the Church, or approve of those who did. If I should argue thus, Christ hath exhorted us, *to love one another, as he hath loved us; and to be one, as he and the Father are one*: Therefore it is lawful to tear the Church in pieces, to set up in opposition to lawful Authority, and make endless Divisions; and those who do so, ought to be accounted *Saints* for it, and applauded as Men who abounded with *Charity, Meekness and Goodness*; certainly some Men would say I was mad; and yet this is the force of his Argument, if it have any force at all. I may have Charity for Men's Persons, though I should have none for their *Sins*: Nor is it any *Charity* to their Persons to en-

courage

courage them in their *Sins*, much less to make their *Sin* their *Commendation*: For this were to help them forward to *Destruction*. The best Charity is, whether they will hear or forbear, to cry out against their Sin, and if possible to make them so sensible of it, that they may forsake it.

(13.) It may seem strange, that a Man of our Author's Parts, Age and Learning, should be guilty of such wild loose Reasoning: But at last, I think he hath discovered to us the Mother-mistake, which hath misled him, and which with him doth pass for an undoubted Axiom, viz. That many may be in the Communion of Saints, who do not hold external Communion one with another, (p. 24, 25.) Now this is somewhat ambiguously spoken, as most Oracles are. For there can be no Christian whatsoever, who can be said to be strictly and immediately in external Communion with all true Churches; and therefore there can be no Christians whatsoever, but in some sense may be said not to have external Communion one with another; if therefore we will understand his Proposition in such a sense as may be to the present purpose, by not holding Communion one with another, must be meant not holding Communion with any true Church whatsoever; and then barring extraordinary cases, to which I see not how our present Dispute hath any relation, I shall at this time only offer two things in answer hereto. 1st, That our right to, and interest in the *Mystical* or *Invisible Church*, is by becoming *Members* of the *Visible Church*. And this I think our Author cannot well deny, who to the being of a Christian requires not only the acknowledgment of *one Lord*, and *one Faith*, but also of *one Baptism*. For to what end requires he *Baptism*, unless to be admitted into the *Visible Church*, except he have any such Enthusiastical Notion of Baptism, which he hath not yet discovered,

and, I hope, he is not tainted with? And as the Right to the Mystical comes by being Members of the Visible Church; so the Covenants are sealed to us, and the gracious Influences descend from the Head to the Members by means of the Administrations of those, who have authority from Christ to dispense his Ordinances, and bless the People in his Name. Nor is it to any purpose to say, that besides the good, there are bad in the Visible Church, who receive no benefit by these Dispensations; for it is their own fault that they do not; and even the Good and Sound have not the Covenants sealed to them, nor receive any of these Benefits and Influences but by means of these Administrations. And to deny this, is to render the whole Ministry of the Gospel useless and insignificant. Now I desire to know, how this can consist with a Man's being in the *Communion of Saints*, without being in *Communion with any Church of God on Earth*? How he can have the *Covenants* sealed to him, who deprives himself of all the *means* of it? 2dly, This Assertion overthrows all *Communion*, all *Order*, all *Government*, and destroys the *Church* it self, as it is a *Body*, to which the Promises are made, and crumbles it into Atoms. For if many may be of such *Communion* without external *Communion*, there is no reason to deny the rest the same privilege, and so all may be so. At this rate every Man may separately set up for himself, and then what becomes of the *Church* as a *Society*? What use is there of any *Ministry*? This is the utmost of Confusion, and makes the Profession of Christianity the most absurd and unaccountable thing in the World. But perhaps I may have occasion to speak farther of this hereafter. In conclusion of this Topick, I desire the Reader only to take notice, that though our Author doth take

take some pains to extenuate the Sin of Schifm, yet he grants it to be a Sin, but doth not compare it with Murther or Adultery, that he might prove it by Scripture to be a lesser or a greater Sin, which was his business to have done, and which he had obliged himself to, by the Proposition he had laid down.

C H A P. V.

The Author's Inconsistency in his pretended Designs,

§. 1. *A general Answer to his Question, Are they damn'd?* 2. *The Question unreasonable,* 3. *An Answer to the Instance of the Pharisees and Sadducees,* 4. *To the Dispute among the Disciples,* 5. *To the several Instances of the murmuring Grecians, the Jews contending with Peter, the Contention at Antioch with Paul and Barnabas,* 6. *To the Divisions among the Corinthians,* 7. *His Instance in Diotrephes, &c. full against himself,* 8. *The Difference in the Church of Rome concerning Meats and Days considered,* 9. *The Opinion (if true) That St. Peter and St. Paul were at the same time Bishops of Rome no Precedent for the future,* 10. *His Guess from Clemens Romanus proved groundless, and St. Jerom's Mistake shewn,* 11. *The different Observation of Easter cleared,* 12. *The Novatian Schism, both at Rome and Carthage, considered,* 13. *The Contest between St. Cyprian and Stephen Bishop of Rome examined, and found to make nothing for his purpose,* 14. *The Case of Origen and his Writings as little,* 15. *So also the Difference between Petrus Alexandrinus and Meletius,* 16. *Nor the Bishop's mutual Accusations burnt by the Emperor Constantine, any thing affect this matter,* 17. *The Case of*

the Audeans considered, 18. And also that of Liberius and Pœlix, and of Damasus and Ursicinus, 19. And that of Lucifer Calaritanus, 20. And of Aetius, 21. Of Priscillian, 22. The Divisions at Antioch after the Deposition of Eustathius, 23. The Case of the Donatists, 24. Of St. Chrysostom and the Joannites, 25. Of the Acephali or Hæsitantes, 26. Of Austin and the Britons, 27. Of imposing the Gregorian Liturgy, 28. Of Ignatius and Photius, 29. Of the Schism between the Greek and Latin Churches, 30. Of several in the Popedom, 31. Of the Albigenes and Waldenses, 32. Of the Jesuits and secular Priests, &c. 33. The Author's Inconsistency, 34. Of the Lutherans and Calvinists, and the Remonstrants and Antiremonstrants, 35. His Partiality to the Hugonots, 36. And Malice against Episcopacy, 37. And the Non-jurors, 38. A general Answer to the Case of Protestant Dissenters, 39.

(1.) **W**E come now to that, which he intended for his principal Argument and chief Flourish, and which gives the Title to his Book; and thus he lays it down.

This horrid Opinion cuts off a great part of Christ's Church, and damns Multitudes of excellent Persons in all Ages and Places, as will be evident (he saith) by his short History of Schisms.

In composing this he hath pick'd and cull'd, and made a Hodgpodge rather than a History: But before we can come to it, he is pleased to entertain us with a Preamble, of which notice must be taken, or he will think himself wronged. He tells us, *That he writes not this to make Schism seem a small thing, or to encourage any to run into it, or continue in it.* Truly if this be not his Design, I know not what is, unless it be to quite lose Schism by

by jumbling us all together, and making us such a Gallimaufry, as the World yet never knew. If to *lessen Schism*, and *canonize Schismaticks*, be not to *encourage* it, and make it a *small thing*, I would fain know what is? If this be not the Design carry'd on throughout his whole Book, let any indifferent Person judge. But, if you can believe it, it is *much less* his Design to *beget in any low Thoughts of Antiquity*, which (he saith) *he doth greatly Revere and Value*, (p. 25.) And is it not an undeniable Evidence of that his *Reverence and Value*, to condemn their received and approved Notion, as *Horrid, Abominable and Foolish*? I remember I once saw a *Serjeant* dragging a *Gentlewoman* to th' *Gaol*, and all the while he told her, he had a *great respect for her*, and *meant her no hurt*. If you will know some Men's Meaning, you must read it backward. At last he is pleased to tell us what his Design is, *viz. To shew the troublesome State of the Church of God all along, and the sore Conflicts it hath had*. Now this *troublesome State*, and these *sore Conflicts* were caused chiefly by *Schismaticks* and *Hereticks*; and if this had been brought as a Reason to prove Schism as great a *Sin* as *Murder* or *Adultery*, and that we ought to do all we honestly can to extirpate so mischievous and turbulent an Evil, I think it might have pass'd muster: But to alledge this as his motive to represent *Schismaticks* as *white Boys*, and very *charitable Christians*, is such a *Paradox* as I have seldom met with. Indeed there have been Men, who have writ in praise of the *French Pox*, and brought many subtil Reasons to prove, That *it is good to be in debt*, wherein they have shewed abundance of *Wit*; but never any Man thought them to be *serious*, and in full *earnest*, as our Author seems to be all along. This certainly is *doct delirare*, but not *ingeniose insanire*. The state of the Church in *St. Cyprian's*

time, which in the next place he describes in a Translation of St. *Cyprian's* words, we may with shame enough own to be too much like our present Case; but I think it a bad Reason to prove, that therefore we ought to cherish and encourage those Errors, Heresies and Schisms, which in a great measure make it so.

(2.) He comes on now with his *History of Schism*, and all along as he reckons them, at every turn the Burthen of the Song is, *are these damn'd? Or must these be damn'd?* Now *Damnation* is a terrible word, and therefore before I come to Particulars, I must crave leave to premise two Distinctions. 1st, Between those that are Schismatics, and those that are not. For he makes many Schismatics, which are not so. And there is no reason in the World to *damn* them for his giving them an *ill name*, which they do not deserve. 2^{dly}, Between the *Dead* and the *Living*. As for the *Dead*, what have we to do with them? Their *Errors* justly condemn'd by the Church, we ought still to condemn, and not to promote or encourage a Succession of those Errors, which were the cause of so great Troubles, and will ever be so, wherever they are. But as for their *Persons*, they are gone from us, and must stand or fall by the Judgment of God. We may not certainly know, whether they died penitent or impenitent; and therefore it becomes not us peremptorily to determine of their Salvation or Damnation: Neither do they now belong to us; and therefore we ought not to take the Judgment out of God's hand. But how uncertain soever their State may be, *quoad nos*, we may certainly judge of their Errors, and ought to avoid them. For the uncertainty of their State ought not to be made an encouragement to follow them in their Sin, but rather the contrary. As for the *Living*, it is certain they are not *damn'd* yet,

yet, but that hinders not but that they may be in a *damnable Condition*. And therefore it would be a very uncharitable, cruel and wicked part in us to sow Pillows under their Elbows, and encourage them in their Sin, that they may run the hazard of Damnation for it. It ill becomes *Ministers*, and indeed any *Christians* whatsoever, to become *Advocates* for *Wickedness*, and *Promoters* of *Broils*; but they ought rather to represent their Sin to them as odious and as dangerous as may be, that they may be convinc'd of it, and forsake it; that so these unchristian Feuds may have an end, which will never cease, while these Schisms are maintained. This might serve for an Answer to his whole History; But because he seems to value himself upon this, as if his great Strength lay herein, I shall now descend to the Particulars; tho' it is somewhat an unreasonable task to be obliged to answer every one of such a tedious long string of Questions, when this general Answer might be sufficient to shew the impertinency of them.

(3.) The first is a swinger: *In all Ages* (saith he, p. 26.) *there have been some who have caused Divisions in Churches, more or less, or have separated from Churches, and been call'd Schismaticks; but were they all damn'd?* And I might as well put the Question, *Were they all sav'd?* God only knows how it is with them: But this Question is incapable of any certain Answer from Man. I do not pretend to give an account of what hath been done by all particular Persons *in all Ages*; the knowledge of their Condition is so remote from us, and various Degrees and Circumstances might so alter the several Cases, that no general Answer can suit them all. Nor is the Question any thing to the purpose: For whether they were *damn'd* or *sav'd*, it follows not; but that those, who now cause such turbulent Schisms, and abet them, may be

be guilty of *damnable Sin*, and consequently in a *damnable Condition*; and therefore to warn them to get out of it is true *Christian Charity*, left in the end they should be *damn'd indeed*.

(4.) We are oblig'd to him, that he *will not mention the Schisms in the Old Testament*; for then, after his way of making Schismatics, I know not when we should have done. Yet he cannot pass by that notorious one of the *Pharisees and Sadducees*: But these were rather different *Factions* than *Communions*, as himself in effect confesseth, when he tells us, that *they worshipp'd in the same Temple*. But be they what they will, he tells us from *Josephus*, That *John Hyrcanus kill'd many of the Pharisees; and his Son Alexander Jannæus many thousands of them; but that Alexandra his Widow seeing the Pharisees in greater esteem with the People, join'd with them, and by degrees kill'd the chief Sadducees*; and then puts the Question, *Were all or one part of these damn'd?* A short Answer may serve to this. For whether they were *Schismatics* or not, it is certain they were *Murderers*; and if neither *Schism*, nor *Murder*, nor both together, can make up a *damnable Sin*, it is not a Pin matter, which of the Sins is the greater or the less, which was the thing in dispute. It will be an easie matter to be *Saints*, if at this rate we can dispute away our *Sins*.

(5.) The *Old Testament* hath done him small service; let us now see, whether he hath any better success under the *New*. And here he saith, (p. 27.) *A beginning of these Evils was seen even in our Lord's own little Family*; and to prove this, he cites those places of Scripture, which mention a *dispute or strife among them, which should be the greatest*: That it was so, is very true; but I cannot imagine how he could think it any thing to his purpose to bring it in here, since in the same Breath he confesseth, that

it was far from rising up to a Schism; and seeing our blessed Saviour reprov'd them for this, I think it is fair warning to us, not only to avoid Schism it self, but even the least matters that have a tendency to it; but then this makes but a bad Argument in defence of Schism. Indeed he himself confesseth, that these things were written to teach us, to look well to our selves, to repress such Evils, and be tender to one another: But at this time, and in his sense, these things are ill put together; for to be so tender of Schismatics, as to encourage and plead for them, is not the way to repress such Evils. I wish they were repress'd, but it will never be done this way.

(6.) To as little purpose is his Instance of the *murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their Widows were neglected in the daily ministration*, (Acts 6. 1.) Here was complaint of a Neglect, and it was presently amended. Was here any forsaking of the Communion? And if such care was taken to prevent the Scandal of lesser Faults, how much greater care ought to be taken to prevent the greater Crime of Schism, which swells Men's Hearts with Wrath and Malice, and tears the Church in pieces? What he farther saith concerning *the Jews contending with Peter*, might as well have been let alone: For, did that rise to a Schism? And if it had, it had been worse. But the case was thus: It was not then well understood, that the Wall of Partition was broken down; and the Gentiles to be admitted into the *Peculium*; and therefore the Jews thought that none were to be received but as formerly, upon the Terms prescribed by the Law of *Moses*; and to convince them of this mistake, grounded upon the *Mosaical Law*; there was need of no less than a Miracle, *viz.* The descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Believing Gentiles; which *Peter* had no sooner related, but they

they did not only rest satisfied, but *also glorified God*, (Acts 11. 48.) Doth not this make an excellent Plea for Schism? The Contention with *Paul* and *Barnabas* at *Antioch* was upon the very same account; and was determined by the Apostles at *Jerusalem* to prevent Schism; and therefore is very unhappily drawn in by our Author to patronize Schism. It is indeed true, which he saith, That *those that are Chief in the Church are to condescend far, as Peter and Paul did, for the prevention or cure of Schism*, (p. 28.) But must they condescend to the Destruction of the Church? Must they be always condescending to Persons that will never be satisfied? If the Rulers ought to do much, must others do nothing? Or to what purpose shall Rulers do any thing, if no body will obey them? Or if it be told the *Shepherd*, that he ought to take care of the *Flock*, will it be a good Argument, that therefore he ought to let the *Sheep* wander whither they will, and *stray away* till they are *lost*?

(7.) He seemeth to confess, that all this is little to the purpose: For why else doth he now talk of *coming to real Schism*, but that what he had before discoursed on was not so? And he saith, That *in the Church of Corinth there was one*;—*there were Contentions, Envyings, Strife, Divisions or Schisms among them*: And then, saith he, *were they that were guilty of them damn'd?* (p. 28.) But in none of those places cited in his Margin, is Schism mentioned, except in one, (1 Cor. 11. 18.) where the Apostle relates what was told him of them, that there were, *οἰσμῶν, Schisms among them*; and his answer is, *καὶ μὲν οὕτως ἔστιν, I believe it in part*; i. e. that though there be not a *formal Schism*, yet there was that which did somewhat partake of the *nature* of it, and had a strong tendency to it. For *Faction* was very near of kin

to *Schism*; but yet it was not really and full *Schism*: It was not *Schism* in the Notion the *Ancients* understood it, nor of the nature of that *Schism*, about which we are now disputing; for our Author himself confesseth, that *they made no Separation*. But if their Contentions had been carry'd so high by any of them, as on that account to depart from the Church, I desire him to tell me, how they could be saved out of it?

(8.) Considering the Cause he hath undertaken, I wonder what should prevail with him to insert the next Paragraph: For, if I mistake not, it is a desperate stab into the very Vitals of his Cause; and that you may be the better judge of it, I will transcribe it entirely. *We read* (saith he, p. 28, 29.) *of one Schismatick, of whose Salvation we may justly doubt; Diotrephes, who lov'd to have the pre-eminence, who prated against the Apostle John with malicious words, and receiv'd not the Brethren, but forbad them that would, and cast them out of the Church. And St. Jude says, That in the last times there should be Mockers, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts; that should separate themselves, sensual, not having the Spirit. And St. Paul says, Mark them which cause Divisions and Offences, contrary to what you have learnt, and avoid them; for such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own Belly, and by fair Speeches deceive the Souls of the simple. They that are guilty of such Schism, are in a state of Damnation.* Hitherto our Author hath had a particular care of *Schismaticks* to save them from *Damnation*, as far as his Arguments would go: I wish he had taken half the pains to make them sensible of their Sin, and forsake it, that they might really escape *Damnation*. But on a sudden he is got into a *damning humour*; for considering that the Persons, to whom the words of those Apostles have a more particular relation, were

were dead many hundred Years since, he might as well have said plainly, they were *damm'd*, as that they were in a *state of Damnation*. It is indeed true, that those words were intended not only against the then present turbulent Persons, but against all that afterwards should be guilty of the like Practices, and are equally applicable to them: If therefore the Schism, which now reigns, and to which our discourse (if to the purpose) ought to be directed, be of the same nature with what the Apostles here condemn, I think our dispute is at an end; because then our Author hath brought in a Verdict against himself, and all his other Ramblements will be impertinent. I fear the Love of Pre-eminence hath prevailed with too many, first to make, and then to foment and cherish these flaming Schisms amongst us: For why else do they deny obedience to their lawful Superiors, and set up against them without any Authority at all? And if *Diotrephes* prated against *St. John* the Apostle with malicious words, do not they the same against the Successors of the Apostles, whom they ought to obey and reverence? I have never heard more *bitter* nor more *fulsome* Language, nor uttered with more *rancour* and *malignity of Spirit*, than what hath plentifully flowed out of the Mouths of *Dissenters*, against lawful *Church Governors*; they have rack'd their Invention for ugly Names, and the worst they could devise have been thought too good for them. And then for *mocking* and *scoffing*, though they do it ill-favour'dly, yet none do it more. And then for *separating themselves*, who have done it but they? There had been no Separation, if they had not made it; and what they have done, was without any reasonable Cause. And if we ought to *mark those which cause Divisions and Offences*, whom can we mark but the *Dissenters*, who have both actually
and

and wickedly made these *Divisions*? And if we must avoid such, how will this stand with *Occasional Conformity*? And as for *deceiving the Souls of the Simple by fair Speeches*, I think that, and *creeping into Houses, and leading captive silly Women*, is well known to be no small part of their Trade. Thus the Character which he gives those *Schismatics*, which he acknowledgeth to be in a state of *Damnation*, too well fits his *Dissenters*; and therefore let them look to it, how they run the hazard, lest the Clutter he makes afterwards to persuade them otherwise, should not pass for a good Plea at the Day of Judgment. But I shall have occasion to speak more particularly to the *Schism* hereafter; I must now follow him, while he slides away from what he hath here said.

(9.) He came too near the Mark now, but henceforward he will take care to keep at a distance; but however you shall have something like it. To which end he begins thus: *We read of a great Difference in the famous Church of Rome: some did eat all things, and others only Herbs; some observed Days, and others esteem'd every Day alike, &c.* And then he tells us, That the *Apostle exhorted them to bear with one another, but imposed no Laws upon them in those things*; and so concludes with the old Song, *Who dare say, that those were damn'd?* Now what is all this to the purpose? If Mr. *Tablets* will forsake his *Schism*, and return into the Bosome of the Church, he, and as many as he shall bring with him, may have the liberty to eat Herbs, or let them alone; to eat Meat, or to fast. But we are not at all concern'd in the Contest here spoken of; for it relates only to the then different Opinions of *Christians concerning the Jewish Observances of Food or Festivals*; of which there is now no doubt among us. The Gentile Christians rightly thought themselves at liberty from the *Mosaical Rights and Usages*;

Usages; and so did some of the Jews; but others of them did not yet understand themselves to be discharged from the Obligations of *Moses's* Law in those matters; and therefore though they receiv'd and profess'd the *Christian Faith*, yet constantly observed the *Jewish Customs*; and if this was an Injury to any, it was to themselves, in clogging and making themselves uneasie with unnecessary Observations. That of eating *only Herbs*, seems to have a particular relation to the *Essenes*, who (as *Josephus* tells us) lived upon the Fruits of the Ground, and were the most pious and devout Sect among the Jews, and therefore best prepared for the reception of Christianity; but when they did receive it, were not willing to forsake their old Customs and strict way of Living. That of *observing Days*, seems to have respect to the Jews in general, who thought themselves obliged to observe the *New Moons, Sabbaths*, and other *Festivals* prescribed by the Law of *Moses*. Now whilst for the quiet of their own Minds they burthened only themselves with these things, continued in the Communion, and left others at their liberty, it was an Argument of the non-necessity of those matters, and shew'd their Charity; and so long they were rather to be pitied than blamed; because, if they had done otherwise, they had acted contrary to the Persuasion of their own Minds, which had made that a Sin to them, which otherwise was no Sin in it self. But whereas he saith, That the *Apostle imposed no Laws upon them in those things*; certainly he is mistaken: For he plainly determines the Case, and lays down Rules for their Practice. *Let (saith he) every Man be fully persuaded in his own Mind. Let us not therefore judge one another any more. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died. Let not then your good be evil spoken of. For Meat destroy not the Work of*
God,

God, (Rom. 14. 5, 13, 15, 16, 20.) All these were Laws and Rules for their Behaviour in that particular case, which they ought not to transgress. And even in this very case, when they exceeded their bounds, and would impose the Observation of *Moses's* Law on all others, as well as themselves, as necessary to Salvation, and thereby were in danger of running into Schism. The same *St. Paul* spares them not, and not only faith, but proves them to be in the way of *Damnation*: For (saith he, *Gal.* 2. 21.) *if Righteousness come by the Law, then Christ is dead in vain.* And again, *For as many as are of the Works of the Law, are under the Curse,* (Chap. 3. 10.) And still more plainly and fully: *If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. — Christ is become of no effect unto you; whosoever of you are justified by the Law, ye are fallen from Grace,* (Chap. 5. 2, 4.) Now the Controversie among those of the Church of *Rome*, cited by our Author, was the same with that amongst the *Galatians*; and therefore if they had despised the Authority of the Apostle, and broke through those Laws and Rules which he gave them, and carry'd the matter so high, as to cause a *Schism*, or be ripe for it, doubtless the Apostle would have been no more partial to them, than he was to the *Galatians*, but would have plainly told them, that *Christ should profit them nothing*, and consequently that they were in a state of *Damnation*; and if *St. Paul* had said this, any one might have said it after him: So that this makes nothing for *Schism*, but against it.

(10.) The reverend and learned *Dr. Hammond* had laid it down as a very probable Opinion, that at the first planting of Christianity there were at *Rome* two Churches, the one consisting of *Jewish Converts*, the other of *Gentile Christians*; whereof *St. Paul* was Bishop of the one, and *St. Peter* of the

other: That *Linus*, and after him *Cletus* or *Anacletus* succeeded *St. Paul*, and *Clemens* *St. Peter*, but that both at last (I suppose after the Death of *Linus* and *Cletus*) were joined together under *Clemens*: And so they continued. Of this he lays hold, as if he had got a mighty advantage, and thus argues: *If because of diversity in Opinion, or for other Reasons, there were two such distinct Churches in Rome under (plain) Peter and Paul, and neither of them were Schismatics, it follows there may be upon weighty Reasons, nay ought to be sometimes, two Churches in the same City or Place, both faithful Members of Christ, and without any guilt of Schism, &c.* (p. 30.) Now, that we may make no more disputes than needs must, *dato non concessio*, we will suppose the matter of Fact to be true, that there were two such Churches and Bishops; but then I shall shew, that it will do him no service, and that his Reasoning from it is inconsequent. For, 1st, Are we divided into *Jews* and *Gentiles*? If two distinct People did for some time keep themselves distinct, is that a Reason for those who are one People, united in their common Birthrights, Laws, Government and Relations, unnecessarily to divide themselves? A distinction of Churches was plainly an inconvenience in those who were a distinct People; and therefore it can be no better than Folly to divide them, who are or ought to be one. 2^{dly}, Can you pretend to any such Authority for distinct Churches in the same place, as *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* had? They had their special Commissions for this very thing, which *St. Paul* alledgeth, telling us, That the Gospel of the Uncircumcision was committed to him, as the Gospel of the Circumcision was unto *Peter*. For (saith he, *Gal.* 2. 7, 8.) he that wrought effectually in *Peter* to the Apostleship of the Circumcision, the same was mighty in me towards the Gentiles. Here was Authority

thority and Ability immediately from Heaven conferred on them for this very purpose : And further to prevent all Scruple and Dissatisfaction that might arise on this account in the Minds of any, there was also the open agreement, direction and order of the Apostles themselves in this very case. Thus saith St. Paul, *When James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be Pillars, perceived the Grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of Fellowship; that we should go unto the Heathen, and they unto the Circumcision,* (Gal. 2.9.) Now have you (whether Presbyterians or Independents, or any other Sect) any such Authority as this? Indeed have you any Authority at all? If you have any Authority, it must either be immediate and extraordinary, or mediate and ordinary. If you pretend to immediate Authority, (and I know not how far Enthusiasm may prevail with some of you.) I desire you would produce your Credentials and Testimonials: Let's see you work Miracles, as the Apostles did. If you lay Claim to a mediate Authority, it must be derived from those, who by a due Succession are vested with an Authority to give it. And in this respect, I fear, that no small number of you, upon examination, will be found to be meer Muslaroms, sprung up without Root, such as have either set up of themselves, or pretend to derive it from those, who have no power to give it. And as for the rest, who perhaps might come in by the Door, but have since run away from the House, the best you can make of them is *Revolters*, who setting up against their *lawful Superiors*, have thereby render'd all their *Acts* and *Ministrations* *invalid* and *null*. But of this I intend more hereafter: And having said thus much, I need not farther urge, that these Men act not by agreement, and in consent, as the Apostles did;

but in direct opposition to those, to whom they owe Obedience; and so are no better than Mutineers. 3dly, If you enquire into the Reason of this supposed distinction of Churches, you will find it nothing favourable to the present Schism. One Reason of it (among others) Dr. Hammond supposeth might be *the several Languages which they were of necessity to use in their Assemblies*, (Rev. 11. note b.) Now by the way, if you grant this, it seems to be a good Argument against the Service of the Church of *Rome* in an unknown Tongue. For if the Church did permit and suffer distinct Assemblies (which is otherwise abhorr'd, and by all possible means avoided) rather than the publick Worship should not be performed in a Language familiar to the People, certainly it did by no means approve of it in an unknown Tongue. But what necessity of this is there among us? Do not we all speak the same Language? Is not the publick Worship performed in a Speech as well known to the Dissenters as any of us? So that here can be no complaint on this account, unless they have all lost their own Mother-Tongue. But though this might be one Reason or Motive, yet I take it not to be the principal. The *Jews* did avoid any free Conversation with the *Gentiles*, as being afraid of incurring *legal Uncleanesses* and *Pollutions* by that means: And they had many *Rites* and *Customs*, which they thought themselves bound strictly to observe, which were by no means agreeable to the *Gentiles*, and which they neither would nor ought to be constrained to observe, though the *Jews* generally expected it from them; and this might prevail with them to keep themselves apart, and assemble by themselves. This will appear more clearly from the Behaviour of the *Jews* at *Antioch*, who though converted to *Christianity*, yet were so strict to their old Customs,

that

that they would not so much as eat with the *Gentiles*, who did not comply with them therein. The Apostles indeed, for good Reasons at that time, freely and indifferently apply themselves to, and converse with either of these Parties: And for that cause St. Paul blames St. Peter, That *before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: But when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them which were of the Circumcision*, (Gal. 2. 12.) This St. Paul looks on as a destroying the Indifferency (if barely consider'd in it self) of either's customary way of living, and a condemning the *Gentiles*, unless they punctually observed all the *Jewish* Customs; and therefore he pleads the Case with him thus: *If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?* (Gal. 2. 14.) These Jewish Customs, though innocently practicable as things indifferent in themselves, were not to be forc'd on the Gentiles as necessary by the Law of *Moses*, but in that respect to be laid aside by all. But then it is to be considered, that the Jews had taken up those Customs by vertue of a Law delivered to them from God himself; and so it was not very easie to get off from them. And though *Moses's* Law was expired, yet seeing God was the Author of it, it was to be decently buried, and a reasonable time allowed to Men to wear off their strong Prejudices: And since they had all along been God's peculiar People, a particular care ought to have been had of them, and great tenderness shew'd to them. But now, have our Adversaries any such Plea as this? Are they a peculiar People, chosen by God from the rest of the World, and settled under a divine Establishment, antecedent to the Gospel, which we all own? Nay, are they so much as a People or Nation distinct from us?

Can they pretend to any other Law, than the Gospel, which by a seeming Obligation may make a colourable pretence for such doings? Or rather, do they not, like *Corab* and his Company, rebelliously stand up against the Authority God hath placed in his Church, and in so doing rebel against God himself? For this is the Interpretation our Saviour himself makes of it: *He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me*, (Luke 10. 16.) When they can make their Case the same with the *Jews*, they shall have the same Favour and Forbearance: But that can never be. For, *Lastly*, Let the most that can be made of this Case, it will amount to no more than a present prudential Forbearance, or temporary Permission in such a case, as, if it did ever happen before, it can never happen again. Because no other Dispensation is to succeed to, and supersede the Authority of the Gospel to the end of the World. The *Jewish Oeconomy* was to cease when our Blessed Saviour had fulfilled the Law in all Righteousness; but then it ought to be considered, that they had their Law from God, and had been his peculiar People; and you may reasonably suppose, that they would not easily quit either their *Privileges* or their *Law*: And therefore it was very reasonable, that those who had the benefit should allow them fair time to look into their Mistake, and to take all possible pains to convince them of it. But when this was done, if they continued obstinate, and would not be prevail'd on, they were not to be suffer'd to be longer troublesome to the Church; and accordingly after some time a Coalition was made, and these Authorities joined in one Person, as our Author himself acknowledgeth: And as it was never done from the beginning, but in favour of them; so it remained a standing Rule of the Church, that
there

there should be only *one Bishop in one City*. And this they did upon a Principle necessary for the support and preservation of the Government of the Church, and consequently of the very Being of the Church it self: For how could it be preserved, if all things must be suffered to run into Disorder and Confusion? The *Bishop* was then judg'd to be the *Representative of Christ*, and the *Head of Unity* to that particular Flock within his District. And this was so the Doctrine of those times, that it was acknowledged by all, and received and approved by all Orthodox Christians, even to the meanest of the Laity, as a necessary Truth. And therefore when at the intercession of the great *Ladies*, and restlessness of the *People*, *Constantinus* found himself under a necessity to recall *Liberius*, whom he had banished; and yet in favour of the *Arians* would have continued *Felix*, and thought to slur the *People*, and still promote his own Design, by giving them two Bishops for one, they unanimously opposed it, and with one Voice cry'd out, *ἓς Θεός, ἓς Χριστός, ἓς Ἐπίσκοπος*, *One God, one Christ, one Bishop*, (Theod. lib. 2. c. 17.) Now if it were true (for it doth not evidently appear) that *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* had two distinct Flocks for a time, one of *Jewish*, the other of *Gentile* Converts; yet from the several Answers given, being laid together, it will be very plain, that That ought never to be drawn into Precedent for any such Practice for the future.

(11.) In the next place he tells a long Story in his own words, from the Epistle of *Clemens Romanus*, written in the Name of the Church of *Rome*, to the Church of *Corinth*, wherein they are blamed for *Seditious* and *ill Practices*, which he will needs call a *Schism*, tho' he confesseth it came not to a *Separation*, and so comes not up to our case. But thence he infers, that if the *Corinthians* had a Bi-

shop then, it's a wonder Clement should not mention him on this so remarkable an occasion; which tempts many to think with Hierom, that Bishops were not brought in till afterward, for a Remedy against Schism, (p. 31, 32.) A small Temptation in some cases will prevail with some sort of Men; but certainly our Author forgot himself, or he would never have mentioned this in this place, when he confesseth Clement to be Bishop of Rome at the same time. And how were they then not brought in till afterwards? He might as well infer, there was then no Bishop of Rome, as that there was no Bishop of Corinth from St. Clement's not mentioning him. For if he mention not the Bishop of Corinth, so neither doth he mention himself, but writes in the Name of the People of Rome to the People of Corinth, upon which account it was not so proper to mention either Bishop. But nevertheless he hath not left *Episcopacy* without a Testimony in this very Epistle: For (which is common with the Fathers) he argues from the Order of the Priesthood under the Law to that under the Gospel. Τῶ γὰρ ἀρχιερεὶ ἰδίαι λειτουργίαι δεδομμένα εἰσι, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἰδίαι ὁ τόπος ὡρεστέλων, καὶ λαϊταῖς ἰδίαι διακονίαι ἐπικεν, (Ep. I. ad Cor. Ser. 40.) i. e. *The proper or peculiar Offices are given to the High Priest; their proper place is assigned to the Priests, and their proper Services are incumbent on the Deacons.* And as if he had foreseen the Iniquity, Peevishness, Pride and Ambition of these Times, he tells us; Οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν εἰνωρὶ ὅτι τὰ κυρεῖς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἐπὶ ἐσχατῇ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι καὶ Ἐπισκοπῆς, (Ser. 44.) i. e. *The Apostles knew from our Lord Jesus Christ, that in succeeding times there should arise Contention about the name of Episcopacy:* And there tells you what Care and Order was taken to prevent it. But not to insist on other Authorities, which might be brought from St. Clement, I think the Testimony of

of *Tertullian* may put the matter out of doubt with any impartial Persons. For as he lived much nearer the time of *St. Clement*, than *St. Jerom*, so his Testimony is full and home to the purpose; and therefore a hundred times more valuable, than the froward groundless Conjecture of angry *St. Jerom*, who, to vindicate the Dignity of his own Order, against the Pride and Insolence of the *Roman Deacons*, ran into the same fault with them, by unfairly reflecting on his Superiors the *Bishops*. *Tertullian* chargeth the Hereticks of his time with Novelty, and that their Doctrine was not from the beginning: But if any of them should dare to pretend to it, he makes them this Challenge, *Edant ergo origines Ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem Episcoporum suorum, ita per Successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apostolis perseveraverint, habuerit Auctorem & Antecessorem*, (Lib. de Præscrip. cap. 31.) i. e. Let them shew the Original of their Churches, and declare the Series of their Bishops so descending by a constant Succession from the beginning, that the first of them had for his Ordainer and Predecessor some one of the Apostles, or those Apostolical Men, who continued constantly with the Apostles. And then to make this Tryal of Skill practicable and easie, he tells them where such a known and undoubted Succession of Bishops from the beginning was then to be found: *Proximè est tibi Achaia, habes Corinthum; si non longè es à Macedonia, habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses; si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum; si autem Italiae adjaces, habes Romanam*, (cap. 36.) i. e. If you be near to Achaia, there you have Corinth; if you are not far from Macedonia, there is not only Philippi, but Thessalonica; if you travel into Asia, there's Ephesus; if you border upon Italy, there's Rome. Here Corinth is first named for a certain Succession of

of *Bishops* from the Apostles time; which might then have been easily disproved, if it had not been unquestionably true; nor durst he have made such an offer to as perverse and audacious Hereticks as ever troubled the Church, if it had not then been so well known and acknowledged as to be out of all doubt. But suppose they had been brought in afterwards for a Remedy against Schism, certainly the Peace and Unity of the Church is of that value, and ought to be so dear to every good Christian, that for that very reason none but desperate Schismatics would oppose them. But (not to give it a harder Name) it is a gross Mistake in St. *Jerom* to say Bishops were brought in afterwards; for they were brought in and established from the beginning: And of this St. *Clement* assures us. For having told us how the Apostles had learnt from Christ himself, that there would in succeeding time be Contention about *Episcopacy*, he then shews the Care they took to prevent it, by establishing the Order in their own time. Ἀλλὰ ταύτῃ ἐν αἰτίᾳ προέγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησεν τῆς προσηρημένης, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος δέδοκταις ὅπως ἴαν κομιδῶσιν, ὁλοκλήρων ἑπὶ δέδοκταις ἀνδρῶν λαίβεγιδυ αὐτῶν; i.e. For this very cause, having perfect foreknowledge, they constituted the aforesaid Persons, (i.e. the Order of Bishops) and then laid down the Rule or Law of Succession; how when those died, other approved Men should succeed in their Office, (Ser. 44.) And indeed had not St. *Jerom*'s Passion at that time blinded him, he would never have let fall such a saying, as reflected on the Wisdom and Care of Jesus Christ God-Man, and all his Apostles; as if in setting up a Dispensation, wherein the Eternal Salvation of all Mankind was concerned, he had left it to such Hazards and Experiments for want of a settled Government, that it might have dwindled away and been lost: For

no Constitution can stand, where the Government is none, or uncertain. Can we think that our Saviour and his Apostles, foreseeing these Contentions and Breaches, should have so little care, as to leave the Church to be provided of a Remedy against them, I know not when, by I know not who? And if we consider the Pride, Peevishness and Perverseness of Men, doubtless the Order of Bishops had never obtained, if they had not been settled from the beginning. And seeing it so much derogates from the Honour of our blessed Saviour and his Apostles, not to have made sufficient provision for the Government of the Church, I would desire the Dissenters for his sake to beware for the future, how they oppose the unadvised Saying of one passionate and irritated Father, against the unanimous consent and whole current of all Antiquity.

(12.) The Controversie *about the Day, on which Easter was to be kept*, which he calls a *Schism*, is the next thing he falls on. And yet as to the proceedings between *Polycarp* and *Anicetus*, he will have it to be only a *Difference*, but no *Schism*; and so little or nothing to our purpose: But *Victor*, he saith, *excommunicated the Asian Churches, and so made the Schism*. And then, telling us of the decent Behaviour of *Irenaeus*, he puts the old Question, *Were those that were guilty of this Schism damn'd?* (p. 32, 33.) Truly it would be a very hard case, if Men should be damn'd for Mr. *Talents's* making a *Schism* of that which was none. That *Victor* loudly threatned Excommunication, I grant; but I find not sufficient Evidence to convince me, that he actually proceeded to it; if he did, it was *errante clave*, and he durst not stand by it, and so it came not to a *Schism*; and therefore there is no reason to *damn* them on that account. But in short, the matter was thus: At the first

first Conversion of the *Gentiles*, great regard was had to the *Jews*, and the Apostles were very careful to give them no offence; hence in the beginning they observed *Easter* on the fourteenth of the Moon with the *Jews*, and even St. Paul himself went up to *Jerusalem*, and submitted to the Usages of the *Jews*, (Acts 20, and 21.) But when the *Jews* obstinately persisted in, and pressed the Obligation of the *Mosaical Law* with necessity to *Salvation*, which was inconsistent with *Salvation* by *Christ*, they were forc'd to separate from them, and then where-ever they founded Churches, were careful to order matters so, as not to give any countenance to that dangerous Opinion; and then directed *Easter* to be kept more suitably to the *Resurrection* on the *Sunday* following the fourteenth of the Moon; but still the Churches of most early Conversion kept it on the fourteenth, not from any Obligation of the *Mosaical Law*, but as a Custom which they had taken up from the beginning: For if they had done it in obedience to *Moses's* Law, they ought to have killed and eaten the *Paschal Lamb*, and done other matters, which were as clearly required at that *Festival* as the time; but there was nothing of this. However, in process of Times, some Misunderstandings arose; both urged (and I believe truly) *Apostolical Institution*; but those who kept it on the *Lord's Day* were apt to accuse the others of *Judaizing*, though, as I think I have shewn, without cause. Hence the Difference between *Polycarp* and *Anicetus*, as being nearer to the Apostles times; and the Reason of the Difference better understood, was easily accommodated, and each left to their own Customs. But after some time it broke out again, and then *Victor* swagger'd mightily on the one side, and *Polycrates* as fiercely on the other; but they were forc'd to let it fall, and come to nothing. And
though

though Uniformity in the Observation had certainly been better, as taking away all occasion of Quarrels; yet considering how tenacious People are of *old Customs*, especially such as are vouched by *great Authorities*, I know not why each might not be allowed (no obligation to Judaism being owned) to observe their own innocent Customs, as well as we or others are not blamed for keeping the *Christian Festivals* at *different times*, by reason of the Difference of the *Julian* and *Gregorian Accounts*. I think here is little cause for *Schism*, and less for *Damning*.

(13.) After thus long trifling, he instanceth in two very flagrant *Schisms*; the one at *Carthage*, the other at *Rome*, and *Novatus* at the bottom of both: And had he fairly set forth the ill Practices of those Men, the Disturbances they raised, and the Mischiefs which followed upon those Schisms, it had been enough to have made any sober Man out of love with them. But his business being to propagate *Schism*, and encourage *Schismatics*, such a course had been preposterous; and therefore he only relates, and that lightly and cursorily some incidental matters; and then braves it with his old Question: *Were all those holy Confessors, and others that differed from Cyprian, damn'd?* Before he puts this Question, he ought to have put some difference between those *holy Confessors*, who upon the account of their long and great Sufferings, were honoured with the Title of *Martyrs*, and those *mad Schismatics*, who made it their business to set the Church on fire. The *Martyrs*, sensible of the Hardships they had undergone, had been too easie and hasty in giving Peace to the *Lapsed*, in prejudice to the *Bishop's Authority*, and the Discipline of the Church; and *Felicissimus*, and *Novatus* too, (though afterwards he took up the quite contrary Opinion) with the utmost importunity, prevail'd

prevail'd with them to do thus, and applauded them in it, with a design to raise a Quarrel between them and their Bishop, and make them leave him, and come over to them, and strengthen their Party; and it had in some measure this effect for some time: But the good *Confessors* came to see their Error, and the Wickedness of the *Schismatics*, and submitted to their Bishop. So St. *Cyprian* himself tells us, (*Respon. ad Cornel.*) *Gloriosi ac boni Confessores, qui de Ecclesia illo incitante discesserant, postea quam ab Urbe ille discessit, ad Ecclesiam reverterunt: i. e. The glorious and pious Confessors, who left the Church at the Instigation of Novatus, returned to it again, when he left Carthage.* And the whole next Epistle, save one, is congratulatory to them upon that account. So that you see here all is well again, and there is no occasion for *Damning*: And I wish our *Schismatics* would take away all cause of Complaint, by following so good an Example. But then as for *Novatus*, and *Felicissimus* and his Complices, the case is quite otherwise: It would be too tedious to give a particular account of them and their Actions; they are gone to their great *Master*, and now belong to none of these inferior Courts. But that you may guess what precious *Saints* they were, whom our Author is so desirous to *save*, I will only trouble you with a piece of the Character of *Novatus*, set down in that Epistle which our Author refers to in his Margin; of which therefore we ought not to suppose him ignorant. *Rerum novarum semper cupidus, avaritiæ inexplibili rapacitate furibundus, arrogantia & stupore superbi tumore inflatus, semper istis Episcopis male cognitus, quasi hæreticus semper & perfidus, omnium sacerdotum voce damnatus, curiosus semper ut prodatur, ad hoc adulatur ut fallat, nunquam fidelis ut diligat; fax & ignis ad conflanda seditionis*

tionis incendia ; Turbo & tempestas ad fidei faci-
enda naufragia, hostis quietis, tranquillitatis ad-
versarius, pacis inimicus : i. e. *A Man always de-
sirous of Innovation, so ravenously covetous, as never
to be satisfied, blown up with Pride and Arrogance,
so known to the Bishops as to be unanimously con-
demn'd by them for an Heretick and a perfidious
Wretch; a Man always inquisitive that he may be-
tray, flattering that he may deceive, never so faith-
ful as to love, a very Firebrand and Incendiary for
raising Sedition; and a Whirlwind and Tempest for
making shipwreck of the Faith, a Stranger to Rest,
an Adversary of Tranquillity, an Enemy of Peace.*
Such a Fellow as this were enough to pollute Hea-
ven, if he should come thither; and yet this is
one of those *Saints*, for whose Salvation Mr. Tal-
lents is so much concern'd, that he will not allow
you to make a Question of it: *The Novatians*
(saith he) *were they all damn'd?* (p. 35.) Truly I
cannot give an account of them all, nor (I verily
believe) he neither; but you see what the Ring-
leader of them was; and if Mr. Tallents have a
mind to bear him company, he may; I hope in
God, I never shall.

(14.) The Contest between Cyprian and Stephen
concerning the Baptism of Hereticks comes next,
wherein St. Cyprian is generally thought to have
gone too far; and truly, with submission to better
Judgments, I think Stephen did so too. For these
very words are charged upon him: *Siquis ergo a
quacunque Haresi venerit ad nos, nihil innovetur
nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illi imponatur in
poenitentiam, (Ep. ad Pompeium.)* i. e. *If any one
come over to us, from any Heresie whatsoever, let
no more be done than what has been usual, that he
may receive Imposition of Hands to qualifie him for
penance.* Now, I think, he ought at least to have
made a distinction of *Heretical Baptism*, and not
promis-

promisculouſly to have admitted all alike. For the *Commiſſion for Baptiſm* runs in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. But there were Hereticks, who denied the Trinity, and I do not well underſtand how their *Baptiſm* could be good, who did not baptize into the *Chriſtian Faith*. And I could wiſh *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* had told the whole Circumſtances of that Man's Story, who being preſent at the *Orthodox Baptiſm*, was ſtruck with a dreadful apprehenſion of his own dangerous Condition; for having been baptized by *Hereticks*, and upon his Knees complain'd to him, bewailing his Caſe, Ἐξομολογέμενος μὲν καὶ ὁμονόμος τῷ βαπτισμῷ, ὃ παρὰ τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς βεβαίηκε, μὴ τοῦτον ἵ) μὴ ὅπως ἔχαιεν τινὰ πρὸς τὴν κοινωνίαν; ἀσεβείας γὰρ ἐνόηο καὶ βλασφημιῶν πληρωθῶς, (Euseb. Eccl. Hiſt. lib. 7. cap: 9.) i. e. *Confeſſing and abjuring the Baptiſm* he had received from *Hereticks*, as being not ſuch as theirs, nor having any thing in common with it, but was full of *Impiety* and *Blasphemies*. Had he told us what thoſe *Impieties* and *Blasphemies* were; we might have better judg'd, whether it could have paſſ'd for *Chriſtian Baptiſm* or not. But to paſs by this, and not intermeddle with any deciſion of the Point, we will come to our Author, who after a confuſed account of the Controverſie, infers thus: *In this Cyprian and his Followers were Schiſmaticks, or elſe Stephen and his, or both*. And then ſings his old Song, *Were they all, or at leaſt one of theſe Parties, damn'd?* (p. 37.) But I think he ſhould have better proved, that both or either were *Schiſmaticks*, before he had talk'd of *damning* them. We ſhould have a World of *Schiſms*, if every thing muſt be accounted a *Schiſm*, where any Controverſie ariſeth, and Men chance to argue or write *pro* and *con*, without breach of *Communion*: At this rate a *Queſtion* cannot be ſtarted and debated, but
one

one or both must be *Schismaticks*. Indeed he had not wanted a colour for what he said, if it had been true which he alledgeth, *That Stephen, Bishop of Rome excommunicated Cyprian, and all that joined with him.* For if there had been such an *Excommunication*, there must have ensued a *Schism*. But this is said without any just ground. All that appears is, that *Stephen* was very angry: *ὁ γὰρ τὸν ἐκείνου* *ἐνίστατο*, is all that *Eusebius* says, (*Lib. 7. cap. 3.*) And from *Firmilian's* Epistle we are informed, that he was so angry, as to use *St. Cyprian's* Messengers barbarously at first; but it was but a fit of Wrath, for he came to himself again, and afterwards wrote to *Cyprian*, and *Cyprian* again to him, styling him *Frater*, which was not an Appellation in those times to be bestowed on a *Schismatick*. And *Valesius* (*Annot. in cap. 5. lib. 7. Eccl. Hist. Euseb.*) proves at large, that there was no *Excommunication* in the case, which would be tedious to insert here. Of the same mind is *Pamalius* (*Pref. in Ep. ad Pompeium*) who to put it out of doubt, cites these words of *St. Augustine*: *Vicit tamen pax Christi in Cordibus eorum, ut in tali discrepatione nullum inter eos malum Schismatis oriretur; i. e. The Peace of Christ so prevail'd in their Hearts, that notwithstanding those Heats, no Schism arose between them.* Now *St. Augustine* being an *African Bishop*, and living so near the times of *St. Cyprian*, could never have said this, if it had come to an *Excommunication*. And doubtless the Church of *Rome* would never have own'd *Cyprian* for a Saint in their Kalendar, (which they do to this day) if he had stood *Excommunicated* by a Bishop of *Rome*. And then, as for *Cyprian*, it is on his part clear as the Sun at Noonday, that he thought there ought to be no *Schism* upon that account; which he plainly signifies to *Stephen*: *Scimus quosdam—salvo inter Collegas pacis, & concordie vinculo, quosdam pro-*

H pria,

pnia, quæ apud se semel sunt usurpata retinere; quæ
 in re nec hos vni cuiquam facimus, aut legem da-
 mus; cum habeat in Ecclesiæ administratione vo-
 luntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque Pæpo-
 situs, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus, (Ep.
 ad Steph.) i. e. *We know—some do hold some Op-
 inions peculiar to themselves, yet so as not to violate
 Peace and Concord with their Brethren; in which
 case we neither offer violence, nor prescribe a Law to
 any, since every Bishop may use his own discretion in
 the administration of his Church, of which he is to
 give an account to God. And that you may not
 think he did this either out of Fear or Comple-
 ment to Stephen, he professeth the same to Juba-
 nus: Hæc tibi breviter pro nostrâ mediocritate
 rescriptimus, Frater Charissime, nemini prescri-
 bentes aut præjudicantes, quod minus unusquisque
 Episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui
 liberam potestatem; i. e. These things have we
 briefly written to you, most dear Brother, according
 to our meanness, neither forejudging of, nor prescri-
 bing to any, but that every Bishop may do as he
 thinks good, having full power to act as he pleaseth.*
 Greater Condescension and Sweetness of Temper
 is rarely to be met with; nor do I see how he
 could shew greater Care and Tenderness of the
 Peace of the Church. I do not think Mr. Talents
 out, when he asks, *Who will not blush to say, these
 Men were damn'd?* But I think he ought to have
 blush'd, when he made them *Schismatics*.

(15.) Origen and his Writings come next upon
 the Stage; and a Man would suspect our Author
 was at Cross Purposes. For never did any Man
 make so many needless *Schisms*, whose design is
 to persuade us, that either there is no *Schism*, or
 none damnable. If every Broil, and every Dif-
 ference in Opinion must necessarily make a *Schism*,
 every Place will be full of *Schisms* as long as the
 World

World stands; but if he will needs call it a *Schism*, yet it is not such a *Schism* as makes a Separation from the Church, and erects *Altar* against *Altar*, which is the Crime objected to our *Dissenters*, and therefore is impertinently urged in this case. However, we will try what he can make of it. And, 1st. He alledges, That *Demetrius*, Bishop of Alexandria, offended with him for that (i. e. making himself an *Episcop*) and for being made a *Presbyter*, not by him, but by the Bishops of Jerusalem and Caesarea, excommunicated him for his Errors, (p. 38.) Origen's incomparable Parts and Learning made him the Admiration of some Men, and the Envy of others; and *Demetrius*, of whom he had best deserved, was most unkind to him; and yet I cannot allow, that he excommunicated him. St. Jerom indeed calls it *Excommunication*; but elder Authors, who are therefore more credible Testimonies, call it *Deposition*, (vid. Val. Annot. ad cap. 23. lib. 6. *Eccl. Hist.*) And this is the rather to be rely'd on, because *Deposition*, not *Excommunication*, in those times was the Punishment of a Man in Holy Orders. Now it is one thing to be deposed, another to be excommunicated; by the first he is reduced to Lay Communion, which breeds no *Schism*; the other thrusts from Communion, and so sometimes may endanger the making a *Schism*. But it matters not whether it were *Excommunication* or *Deposition*, for it never took effect. For being absent, and not legally cited, the Sentence was null; and he wanted not Encouragement to discharge his Office in the Church without making a *Schism*, in whose Communion he continued to his Life's end. The other thing he brings against him is in these words: The Origenists are condemn'd by many Bishops at C. P. and at the fifth General Council at C. P. almost three hundred Years after his Death. If those Bishops at C. P.

were the same as met in that General Council at C. P. what need was there to double the Charge? But how or in what manner that fifth Council at *Constantinople* condemned *Origen* and his Writings, is somewhat difficult to be known; because both *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* positively affirm, that they published no Canons, (*Bever. Pand.* p. 150.) yet from the first Canon of the Council in *Trullo*, called the *Quinisext*, we may reasonably guess, that it was by way of *Anathematizing*. Now it is one thing to *anathematize* a Man's Person, another to *anathematize* his Errors: What effect their *Anathema* could have upon *Origen*, who was dead almost three hundred Years before, I do not well understand. But if any Persons then living did so embrace his Errors, as to teach them *dogmatically*, which many suppose he only proposed *problematically*, it was high time to put a stop to it, and to *anathematize* both *them* and their Errors. But then this was done to prevent a Schism, not to make one; and it had that effect. Yet notwithstanding all this, in Conclusion our Author, after his wonted fashion, puts this Question: *Now Origen, and those that condemn'd his Errors, but would read his Writings, were they damn'd?* (p. 39.) What an idle sleeveless Question is this? *Schism* was our proper business, and now it is come to Reading of *Writings*. Can any Man believe, that the Council was so mad as to *damn* themselves? *Origen* was a Man of unparallel'd Parts and Learning, and the stoutest and ablest Defender of Christianity in his time; but he had his Errors, and perhaps there is no Man living without some: But was he all over Errors? Was he to be condemn'd in gross? He wrote many excellent things; and there was a necessity to read his Writings, and to read them very carefully, that they might separate the Precious from the Vile: And therefore
certainly

certainly those who so read his *Writings*, as to expose his *Errors*, and secure others from falling into them, were to be *commended*, not *damn'd*. If a Man must be *damn'd* for reading worse Authors than *Origen*, with an intent to discover their *Errors*, and fortifie others against them, a *Clergyman's Employment* would certainly be the *worst* in the World. For how shall he be able to refute *Hereticks*, and convince *Gainsayers*, without knowledge of their *Opinions*? And what better way to come to the certain knowledge of their *Opinions*, than by reading their *Writings*? It is true, it is not fit to bring the weak to doubtful Disputations? but if a *Minister* must be *damn'd* for this, he must be *damn'd* for doing that, which in a great measure is his *business*. I doubt not but I shall prove, that there are many Errors in Mr. *Tallent's Short History of Schism*; but I do not fear being *damn'd* for reading it, though I heartily pity those poor Souls who are *deluded* by it. But enough of such trifling stuff.

(16.) It is not worth while to run through the whole Story of *Meletius*, but I cannot easily agree with our Author, where he sets up *Baronius* against *Epiphanius*, telling us, That *Meletius had been deposed by Peter* (Bishop of *Alexandria*) *in a Council for his Crimes*, (p. 40.) For seeing that upon this very occasion the first Council of *Nice* made a Canon to assert the Rights of Metropolitans, which *Meletius* had infring'd by his Ordinations; if *Peter* had deposed him, the Council would either have confirmed that Sentence, and not admitted him; or at least have taken some notice of it, and given some reason, why, notwithstanding such Deposition, they decreed him the honour of a Bishop, tho' they limited him in the Exercise of it. But to make as short work as may be, I shall here only observe, That these Men were both *Bishops*; both

Persons of *exemplary Piety*; both *Confessors* for the Faith, and actually in Prison upon that account at that very time, when the Quarrel arose; their *Practice*, their *Government*, their *Prayers* and *Communion* the very same with each other, and with the *Catholic Church*, which our *Dissenters* cannot pretend to; only that no encouragement might be given to Offenders, and to prevent falling away, *Meletius* was for keeping up strictly to the Discipline of the Church; and *Peter* out of overmuch Compassion for a temporary Relaxation of it: No doubt but the *Lapse* laid hold of this Difference, and for their own advantage blow'd the Coal, extolling *Peter's Compassion*, and decrying *Meletius's Severity*; however it was, the Difference grew to that height, that neither of these two Persons, nor any involved in the Quarrel, would communicate with each other, though the Communion of both was the same. Here we see how great a Fire a small Spark kindled; and ought this to be made an *Encouragement* to countenance and promote Schism, or a *Warning* timely to suppress the least Schism, and take away all occasions of it? And indeed *Mr. Tallent's* whole History of Schism may be fairly and justly turn'd upon himself. For, not to make a fruitless Enquiry, who were *damn'd* or *sav'd*, and lose our selves in a matter, which is not within the compass of our present knowledge, this is certain, That those Schisms caused great Disorders and woful Confusions in the Church, raised Rancour, Malice and Envy in Men's Breasts, often broke out into open Violence and bloody Actions, was a *Stumbling-block* to weak *Christians*, and a *hindrance* to the propagation of the Gospel, by creating an ill Opinion of it in those that were without. And if any Man can think that this can be a good Plea to justify, continue, or encourage Schism; he may as well persuade all the *Professors*

of

of Christianity, that it is their Duty to be an eternal Scandal to their Holy Religion. And tho' I think this might be a sufficient Answer to the whole, yet I shall still follow him through all his Particulars. (17.) As for those Bishops, whose mutual written Accusations the Emperor *Constantine* burnt, and thereby shamed them into Peace and Christian Unity; the Quarrels were *Personal*, and made not a Schism in the Church; and if they had been quarrelling, yet they were not dividing Bishops. And therefore his Question is unfairly put, *Were all those quarrelling and dividing Bishops, and their Followers, damn'd?* (p. 41.) If for every little Quarrel, that has or shall happen, Men must be damn'd, I fear there would be but a very few sav'd. The holy Apostles themselves would hardly escape. For at this rate he might send *Paul* and *Barnabas* to Hell, for their falling out about *John Mark*; and the rest would follow after them, for contending among themselves, who should be greatest? There is a great deal of difference between the unhappy short effects of humane Infirmities, and the embroiling God's Church in continued destructive and scandalous Practices.

(18.) The *Arians* make up the next rank of his Beloved Schismatics: They were a Monkish sort of Christians; and the Character, which he draws in favour of them, is not very disagreeable with the account *Epiphanius* gives of them; but he was willing to forget three things wherewith *Epiphanius* chargeth them. 1st, That they pertinaciously and obstinately insisted upon their Interpretation of that place of Scripture, where God is said to make Man after his own Image, of the Body of Man; and not of the Soul, nor Soul and Body together. 2^{dly}, That they kept Easter with the Jews. And, 3^{dly}, That after they had separated from the Church, they

would not so much as pray with any, (their own Sect excepted) against whose Faith, Life and Communion they had no Exception, as if they maintained a Schism meerly for Schism sake. Now, though it doth not become us peremptorily to determine of the *Salvation* or *Damnation* of these Men, who so many Ages past are gone to receive the Judgment of God, which is not made known to us; yet certainly it is no Christian Prudence to revive a Schism, which was happily extinct so many hundred Years since: But it is still worse to propound it as a *Pattern* for our *Imitation*, and an *Argument* to justify *Schism*; for why else is it urged? And if this can be made our Warrant, we may safely bid defiance to what is orthodox and right, and take up with what our Religion, and all truly Religious Men, have ever condemned. This will be to turn the World upside-down, to substitute Wrong in the place of Right, and settle eternal *Confusions* in the room of *Order, Peace and Unity*.

(19.) In the next Paragraph he jumbles together a short account of *Liberius* and *Felix*, and of the two next after them, *Damasus* and *Ursicinus*. He confesseth there was *bloody work*, a bad encouragement to promote *Schism*; and then after his wonted manner asks, *Was one or both of these Parties damn'd?* Truly I am not for *damning* Men thus by *wholesale*; especially when their particular Case and Circumstances are unknown to us: But if some of them did not deserve it, we may leave off Preaching, and let Vice and Violence take its course. The Case of *Liberius* and *Felix* hath been already spoken to; that of *Damasus* and *Ursicinus* is more difficult: For *Faustinus*, a warm *Luciferian*, who liv'd at that time, positively affirms, that *Ursicinus* was ordained before *Damasus*, upon whom he bestows an ill-favour'd Character; and if this be true, it will concern the *Romanists* to cast about,
how

how to justify the Ordination of *Damasus*. But neither *Socrates* nor *Sozomen* agree to this, both telling us, That *Ursicinus*, whom they call *Ursinus*, being angry and incensed, that *Damasus* at the Election was preferr'd before him, tamper'd with some Bishops, and got himself ordain'd privately, (*Socrat. lib. 4. cap. 29. Soz. lib. 6. cap. 23.*) But here it is to be observ'd, that (humane failings excused) every one of these Bishops were Orthodox, they all approved the Communion of the Church, and were in it; both they and their Partizans allowed not of more than one Bishop in a City, and thought the contrary to be *δισχοριας* (*ὕμῃδον, ἢ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς διαμεῖς ἀλλότρερον.* i.e. *The Pledge or Badge of Discord, and altogether disagreeable from the Laws of the Church.* For thus *Sozomen* says of it in relation to this very cause, (*lib. 4. cap. 15.*) The only Quarrel was, which of them should be that *single Bishop*? And who had the Right to it? For many of them were ready to lose their Lives, rather than endure a *second*. This is the truth of the Case. And doth this look like an Argument to persuade us to *blend* all *Communion*s, to set up *plurality* of *Pastors*; nay, not only to suffer, but encourage those, who have no *Authority*, to take upon them the *Office* of *Pastors*, and *seduc*e the *People*? I think it is rather a Warning not to suffer any thing like it. It is true, that they went too far in vindication of their Quarrel; they ought to have used proper means, and not have murdered one another upon that account. And though *Mr. Tallent*; acknowledgeth many of them thus far *guilty*, yet he will not allow you to say they were *damn'd*. And seeing he will allow neither *Schism* nor *Murder* to be *damnable Sins*, I hope he will be as favourable to other Sins as to those, and then we need not fear any *Sin*, nor stand in need of any *Religion*, *Ministry* or *Communion* at all.

(20.) *Lucifer*, Bishop of *Calaris* in *Sardinia*, is next introduced for a Patron of Schismatics, and after a shuffling account of him and his proceedings, after his usual manner he makes his Challenge, *Who dare say, that Lucifer and his Followers were damn'd?* (p. 42.) *Lucifer* was an angry Man, and I should not be forward to pass the dreadful Sentence of *Damnation* upon any Man for his Passion, though I did not approve it. Men's different Constitutions do much influence their Lives and Manners, and many good Men have been prone to be peevish, as we have *Jonas* for an Example, not for our encouragement, but to warn us to avoid it. But it is not a fair account which he gives of *Lucifer's* Separation and Retirement into *Sardinia*, as if it was because he disapproved of what was determined by *Athanasius*, and the Council at *Alexandria*: For *Socrates* and *Sozomen* both agree, that he did not retract his Consent, which by his Deacon he had given to that Council, (*Socrat. lib. 3. cap. 9. Soz. lib. 5. cap. 13.*) The original of all this Mischief seems to have been his unadvised Ordination of *Paulinus* at *Antioch*, which *Eusebius Vercellensis* not approving when he came thither, it stuck in his Stomach, and his great Spirit could not bear it; and thence forward he sought occasions of Quarrel, and set up for the utmost Rigour and strictness of Discipline. But all this while, you ought to take notice, that it was not a Quarrel with the *Communion*, but the *Persons*, which *Lucifer Calaritanus* made the ground of his Separation; his Faith and way of Worship, and theirs was the same; but he would not join with Persons in the same way, who would not use Offenders with that utmost Rigour, which his severe Temper insisted on. And were *Lucifer* now alive, and the Dissenters to be judg'd by him, I am confident, whatever became of them hereafter, he would
here

here anathematize them every Mother's Son; so that I wonder how MR. TANNER could pitch upon such an instance of *exceptional Severity* to countenance those *hopeless Practices*, for which he is become an Advocate.

(21.) But now make room for the great Father and Founder of *Presbytery*, *Arians*; let him be *Heretic*, or *Schismatick*, or what he will, being the first Author of that *bold Step*, he cannot fail to be a *Saint*, and then who shall dare to *damn* him? But though I know it will offend the Brethren, I will try now well our Author acquits him. He tells us, that *he was very strict and devout*: At least, he ought to be recommended as such, being a *Presbyterian*; and if *Quarrelsome* and *Pious* may pass for *Strictness* and *Devotion*, the Character may be true of him; otherwise I shall desire our Author to furnish himself with better Vouchers, than citing *Epiphanius* for what he never said. But (saith he) *he forsook all, and so did his Followers*. They were not true *Presbyterians* in that; for his Followers now, are not for *forsaking*, but *getting* all. But the truth is, they may pass for good *Presbyterians* for all this. For they *forsook all* only because they could not help it. He gave such Provocations to *Eusebius* his Bishop, who had done what he could to oblige him, that he was not any longer to be endured; and he was so *Censorious*, *Proud*, *Quarrelsome*, and intolerably *Troublesome*, that in their own defence they drove him and his Followers out of all Cities, Towns and Villages, where ever he came. But let him be otherwise what he will, he must necessarily be a *Saint* of the first magnitude; because he held, that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were the same. He began his Heresie too early; for the Establishment and Succession of *Bishops* was then so well known, that it was every where misd put of the World, and so was short-lived. Nor was it

it revived for many hundred Years after, till the Murther of their *Bisbop*, and Disorders at *Geneva*, made them have recourse to this Experiment, that they might cover one Wickedness with another. The Reverend Mr. *Hooker*, in his Preface to his *Ecclesiastical History*, hath excellently described, how *slily*, *submissively* and *precariously* it crept in at first; but it quickly grew so *beadstrong* and *masterless*, as to become the Plague of the *Reformed Churches*, and to set both *Church* and *State* in a flame, where-ever it got footing. *Epiphanius* (*Heref.* 75.) hath been at some pains to confute it, to whom, to avoid tediousness, I refer my Reader. For it were an endless task to make a formal Confutation of all the Heresies and Schisms our Author enumerates. But because, in favour of *Presbytery*, he hath done manifest Injustice to *Epiphanius* in one particular, I shall briefly take notice of that. In his account of *Epiphanius's* Confutation of *Aerius*, he tells us, that *Epiphanius*, with respect to the Apostle (*St. Paul*) saith thus: *Where there were Bishops, he wrote to the Bishops and Deacons; and where there were no Bishops plac'd, he wrote to the Presbyters*, (p. 43.) The first part is true, but the latter false. For he is so far from saying, that he wrote to *Presbyters*, where there were not *Bishops*, that he never mentions his writing to any *Presbyters* at all. Indeed, though he plainly shews, that *Episcopacy* was from the beginning, yet there was not presently *Bishops* in every place, and that either by reason of the want of a sufficient number of Converts, or because there was not presently at hand Persons qualify'd for so great a Charge and Employment; and therefore he would not have us judge of things by their *beginnings* and *imperfect state*, but rather look to their *Establishment*, when *perfected* and *settled*; and then he tells you, that as fast as the Necessities of the Church

Church could be provided for, there was sometimes *Bishops* and *Deacons* without *Priests*; but he never saith, that there were *Priests* without *Bishops*. And I desire this Learned Author to name me one *Priest* in that Age, who by the Laws of the Church was not in Subordination to the *Bishop*. But it is farther to observed of this *Grand Presbyterian Acrius*, that he was also a *rank Arian*; and moreover *Epiphanius*, who saith *Acrius* was then living at the time when he wrote, describes him as a great *Opiniaster*, *proud*, *ambitious*, *envious*, *furious*, *vain-glorious*, and a *rash Broacher of Heresies*. These were the rare Accomplishments of the first Forger of *Presbytery*: And though I do not say he is *damn'd*, yet such Qualities and Actions may justly render any Man's Condition suspicious. But that the first *Presbyterian* may not be *damn'd*, I doubt not but our Author, for the *Brethren's sake*, will use all his Interest and Arguments to get him a *Pardon* or a *Reprieve*; and I shall not at present any farther disturb him about it.

(22.) To avoid the Odium of Defending *Priscillian*, one of the lewdest Hereticks that ever arose, our Author endeavours to cast all the blame on *Ithacius*, who cannot be altogether excused from prevailing with *Maximus* (as our Author saith, p. 43.) *to have him beheaded, with some of his Followers, and the rest to be banished*. But to set this in a better Light, you must know, that the *Synodus Cesar-Augustana* had condemned *Priscillian* and his Accomplices; to avoid whose Censure they play'd many Tricks, and corrupted with Money the Emperor *Gracian's* Officers: But at last, a Rescript coming from the Emperor against them, they fled in a fulsome manner: Take it in the Historian's own words, *Turpi sane pudibundoque comitatu, cum uxoribus atque alienis etiam feminis, in quibus erat Euechroa, (Uxor. Delphidii Rhetoris)*

toris) *ex Filia ejus Procula; de qua fuit in ser-*
uone hominum, Priscilliani super gravidam partum
sibi praeputibus abegisse. And yet they thought by
 their Arts to have secured themselves by imposing
 upon *Damasus* then Bishop of *Rome*, and *Ambrose*
 Bishop of *Milan*; but neither of them would
 vouchsafe so much as to see them. In the mean
 time the Troubles of the State gave them some
 respite: For *Maximus* usurping the Imperial
 Power in *Britain*, was coming into *France*; and
 when he came thither, complaint being afresh
 made to him, the *Synodus Burdegalenfis* by his or-
 der had the hearing of the Cause, by whom the
 Bishops of *Priscillian's* Faction were again con-
 demned; but *Priscillian* himself not daring to
 trust his Cause with them, appealed to the Emper-
 or; (for so they called *Maximus* the Usurper)
 and so was himself the cause of all the bloody
 Work, by declining the Judgment of the Church.
 The Hearing of the Cause was committed to *Eu-*
dus the Praefect, (who as the Historian hath it)
Priscillianum gemino iudicio auditum, corripitque
maiestati, nec dissimulat obsecrans se seduisse Doctri-
nae, non minus pietatis, iustitiae, fidei, et ceteris
virtutibus, meliusque orate solutum, nocentem prae-
sentis. But then he proceeded no farther in the
 matter, than to secure him; and upon relation of
 the matter, left the final Judgment to *Maximus*,
 who gave Sentence that he and his impure Crew
 should be beheaded. Two things here offended
Martin Bishop of *Tours*, and our Historian *Sulpi-*
cius Severus, (*Quarantid. in fine, lib. 2. 1. Dialog. 2.*)
 1st, That a Cause of Ecclesiastical Cognizance was
 taken out of the hands of the Bishops, and deter-
 mined by a Civil Power. 2^{dly}, That the Church
 always abhor'd and condemn'd all proceedings to
 Blood in Ecclesiastical Causes, which our Author
 very justly, as well as smartly, here observes
 against

against the *Romanists*; and I wish there were no occasion to take notice of it against the *Presbyterians*. But St. *Martin* was farther afraid, that *Maximus* being indigent, and yet necessitated to great Expences, would take occasion hence, by a farther Inquisition, to condemn the *Innocent*, as well as the *Guilty*, out of Covetousness, to seize their *Estates* to supply his own wants; and this use the *Tyrant* had made of it, had not *Martin* bestir'd himself. Now the Punishments of the Church are Spiritual Censures, exercised to reclaim Men from vicious Principles or Practices, and with a design to save the *Soul*, not to destroy the *Body*. And while *Ishacius* proceeded no farther, than to expose the Errors and ill Doings of those lewd Wretches, to have them Synodically condemn'd, and to save the Flock from Infection, by driving out these spiritual Lepers, he ought not to be blamed. For herein he did no more than what is the Office and Duty of every Bishop; but to exceed so far, as to encourage and instigate *Maximus* to draw Blood, and take away Men's Lives, was altogether unbecoming a Churchman; And this is what *Martin* and some others justly condemn'd in him. But then every Fault a Man commits doth not make him a *Schismatick*; and this is to be accounted rather a *personal Quarrel*, than a *Schism*. For *Ishacius* alter'd nothing in the Doctrine, Worship, or Communion of the Church; his and *Martin's* Communion were the same, and any innocent Person, of either Communion, might have been admitted to the other: Only *Martin* would not communicate with him, that he might shew his detestation of all Sanguinary Practices. But how doth this fit our Author's purpose? For he is, for having every Man do what is right in his own Eyes, to go to this, that, or the other Communion, as he pleaseth, and be constant to none.

none. And what room is there for any Ecclesiastical Censures, when Men may go where they please, and do what they list? If a Clergyman may not smite with the *Civil Sword*, must he not use the *Weapons* which God hath given him? If one Man overdo his part, must all the rest do just nothing? What *Itbasius* did, and our Author would have, are as opposite as Light and Darknes; and therefore let him be *damn'd* or *sav'd*, he can never be drawn in for a Voucher to Mr. Tallent's Doctrine.

(23.) The next thing he does, is to give some account of the Divisions at *Antioch*, which followed upon the unjust deposition of their Bishop *Eustathius*, first between *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, and after between *Paulinus* and *Flavianus*; and then closeth all with his accustomed Question, *What shall we say of these Eustathians, were they all damn'd? or those that followed Meletius or Flavian? or were all on both sides damn'd?* Perhaps it is fit that *Hereticks* should find much fairer Quarter at the hands of *Schismaticks*, than the *Orthodox*; for they are nearer kin to each other. All this mischief was caused by the *Arians*; and besides all these, there was an *Arian Bishop* at *Antioch*, who at the time of *Constantius* had the favour and power of the Imperial Court to back him, whilst these poor *Orthodox Bishops* lived in a state of Persecution. But of the *Arian Bishops*, (for in that time they were by Succession more than one) not a word; they have the favour done them, that the Question is not put, Whether they who were the *Mischief-makers*; but, whether the *Orthodox Bishops* were *damn'd*? And therefore so far I join with him, as to say, *Away with such horrid Thoughts*. But then I must tell him, that the case is vastly different, there being that to be said for these Men, which can never be said for him

him and his Party. The *Eustatians*, properly so call'd, would not communicate with an *Arian Bishop*, forcibly set over them, but continu'd firm to their *true Bishop* unjustly deposed: But pray what *Bishop* do you adhere to? Some scrupled the Communion with *Meletius*, because he was ordained by *Bishops* tainted with *Arianism*, though he himself was *Orthodox*: What have you to except against the *Ordinations* of our *Bishops*? And indeed how many have you, who call themselves *Ministers*, who came not in by the *Door*, and have no *valid Ordination* at all? *Paulinus* was right in the Faith, but his fault was, that he came in upon another; you are neither for *first* nor *second Bishop*, but just none at all. *Meletius* was so studious of Peace, that he voluntarily made the offer to *Paulinus*, that they might join their Flocks, who were all of the same Faith, and the Survivor take the whole, which was refused by *Paulinus*, as *Theodoret* saith (*lib. 5. cap. 3.*) But the People, weary of the Troubles, at length forc'd this Condition upon them, and made those, whom they thought most likely to break it, to swear, that they would keep it, as *Socrates* tells us (*lib. 5. cap. 5.*) But you, as if you were sworn Enemies to Peace, are not for ending, but perpetuating Schism. God forbid, that I should denounce the Sentence of *Damnation* against these Men; but I heartily wish, that you and your Partizans may so consider of the Error of their Ways, and Evil of their Doings, that they may escape it.

(24.) No sooner are these dismiss'd, but the Donatists are call'd in to appear; and after some short Remarks upon them, he tells us, That the *Papists* foolishly say the Protestants are Donatists, and some say the Protestant Dissenters here are Donatists; but the contrary is evident, (p. 46.) We fear not the *Papists's* Slanders, as being (thanks to God) well
I provided

provided to answer them; and had you attempted to prove what you have boldly said, that *the contrary is evident*, as to the *Dissenters*, it would have given me an opportunity to shew, that in many things they agree with the *Donatists*, and that in some they are worse. The *Donatists* were as perverse a Sect, and raised as troublesome a Schism, as any that had afflicted the Church; and I doubt not but the villainous Practices of some of them are so well known to our Author, that he himself, if he were to pass Sentence, would scarce think them Men fit for *Heaven*: But to avoid this, he puts the Question, *Were they all damn'd?* And why *All*? It is a bloody Battel, where none escapes. It belongs not to me to *damn* or *save* any of them. God hath prescribed us certain Terms or Conditions, in which alone we can be sure; but yet hath reserv'd a farther liberty to himself. How far his extraordinary or uncovenanted Mercies may be extended, we know not; and therefore it is not safe to build upon them: And yet what hard Thoughts soever I might have of the *Ring-leaders*, yet I should cherish hopes for those who were *meerly deceived*; and to deal plainly with you, I have much better thoughts of, and hopes for such *well-meaning Dissenters*, who are misled in the simplicity of their Souls, than I have of their *Masters of Misrule*; who make it their business to delude weak Persons, and do all they can to promote everlasting Distractions.

(25.) Now comes the largest account he hath given of any thing yet; and that is, the difference between *Theophilus of Alexandria*, and *John Chrysostom of Constantinople*, and the Troubles and Mischiefs that followed thereupon, (p. 47 to 51.) I shall not trouble my self to examine all the Particulars, which are related not much amiss; but shall rather come up with his design, which is
after

after his usual manner, to propose some Questions, for the encouragement of Schism; and the first is, *Were these Joannites Schismaticks; and if so, were they damn'd?* I do not see how the least Charge of *Schism* can reach them, whilst their Bishop *Chrysostom* was living; and it would be the hardest case in the World, if Men should be sent to *Hell* for being wronged and abused upon *Earth*: For this was the Case of the *Joannites*. Whilst the Bishop was Orthodox, and owned his Flock, they ought not to renounce him; but their Bishop was unjustly deposed by his Enemies, and driven into Banishment; and when he was dead, his Name was struck out of the Diptychs, which was as far as they were able, to signify to the World, that (if spoken in Mr. *Tallents's* Language) he was one of the *damn'd in Hell*. And though the poor *Joannites* were barbarously used, yet they could not bear this; but how desirous they were of Unity, appears hence, That no sooner was his Name restored, and his Body honourably brought back, but they became one with their Brethren. And before this, *Epiphanius* and *Theophilus* were dead, and the Quarrel died with them; saving that *Cyril* made some opposition, but was forc'd to be quiet, when this was done; so that here was an end of those Troubles. But when will you have done? All these Men, as hot as they were, condemn'd Schism; but you are for propagating it: All these Men, however mistaken in the Cause of their Quarrel, were for *Unity*; but you are for *Division*: All of them own'd *Obedience* to be due to *Canonical Bishops*; but you are so far from obeying any *Bishops*, that you are against *Episcopacy* it self. Several other differences between you and them I might enumerate, but these are sufficient to shew, that whatsoever became of them, this Instance will by no means justify your Proceedings.

(26.) What the *Acephali* or *Hesitantes* (which come next, page 51.) make for you, I cannot comprehend. Whether the Title of *Pervicaces* may not better become you, than that of *Hesitantes*, I leave to the Judgment of impartial Persons. *Acephali*, in some sense, you may be; for though you have as many *Heads* as you list, and shift them as often as you please; yet you have not one *true Head*, such an one as you ought to have. The *Henotirum* of *Zeno*, and *Tria Capitula* of *Justinian*, though both contrived with a design to qualifie and cool, are only sad Examples, what woful work Princes make, when they take into their hands the Power of the Church, and force such things on Men as are inconsistent with its standing Rules or Canons: Nor matters it how many opposed these things. For all this bustle and stir was made, that they might retrieve the Peace and Unity of the Church, and have its Communion incorrupt and entire; nor could there be any quiet, till it was obtained. But your design is quite contrary: For you are endeavouring to justifie Schism, and prove it lawful to keep it always on foot, from Men's Actions, who struggled hard to *destroy Schism*, and *recover Unity*; as if I would say, Men have quarrell'd in order to regain true Peace; therefore I may Quarrel eternally, and suffer there to be no Peace. Of the Logick and Honesty of this Inference let any judge.

(27.) The *Acephali* are followed by *the British Christians that differed from Austin and the Roman Rites*, (p. 54.) The History of this matter we owe, if not wholly, yet chiefly to *Beda*; who, though scarce inferior to any in that Age, yet is plainly retain'd on the *Roman* side, and doth all that he can, unless he would be too openly partial, to baffle the *Britons*; and yet enough may be found
in

in him to defend them. Three things mightily influenced the *Britons*, so as to hinder their compliance with *Austin*. Their *early Conversion*, the *Pride of the Romans*, and the *Injuries they had received from the Saxons*. Their Observation of *Easter* is a plain Argument, that they were of early and *Eastern Conversion*, not *Roman*, and in all probability a Church before *Rome*. For their way of observing *Easter* was before the *Roman* way, which in all likelihood was not introduced but upon the Separation from the *Jews*. That their's was first, appears from the opposition made by those Eastern Churches, which would not comply either with *Anicetus* or *Victor*; and I think it not to be doubted, that the Gospel was, next to the *Jews*, first preach'd and receiv'd among them. Again, their primitive Simplicity is another Argument of the Antiquity of their Faith: For the Names of *Patriarch*, *Arch-Bishop* or *Metropolitan*, were then unknown to them; and the Bishop of *Caerleon*, who was in effect their *Metropolitan*, and as such acknowledged by them, had no other Title, but that of *Episcopus primæ sedis*, according to the Appellation given such in the *Apostolical Canons*. Nor is it inconsiderable, which our Author saith of the *Britons*, that they look'd on them that follow'd *Austin* no better than *Pagans*, communicated no more with them than *Heathens*, (p. 55.) And *Beda* saith this held to his very time, which possibly may be one Reason why he oft speaks so harshly of them; his words are these: *Usque hodie moris est Britonum, fidem Religionemque Anglorum pro nihilo habere, neque in aliquo eis magis communicare quam Paganis: i. e. It is the Custom of the Britons to this day, to make no account of the Religion of the English, and to have no more communion with them than Pagans*, (Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. cap. 20.) Which was truly the Practice of the Pri-

mitive Christians, with respect to refractory Persons and Schismaticks, and that according to the direction of *St. Paul*, that every such Person should be to them *as a Heathen Man and a Publican*. No wonder therefore that the *Britons* were not forward to comply with *Austin* and his Followers, who would impose things novel on them, not agreeing with what they had anciently received. Another thing which obstructed their Agreement, was the Pride of the *Romans*: For *Austin* would have them not only to agree to what he required, but to be subject to him. And though *Beda* tells a fine tale, how *Austin* wrought a Miracle to convince them; by restoring Sight to a Blind Man; which they having leave to try before him, could not do: Yet dropping this, that he was *quidam de genere Anglorum*, makes it suspicious, that there was a Trick in it; and the after-behaviour of the *Britons* shews, that upon Consideration they thought no less. And truly that looks more like a true Miracle, which occasioned the Treaty to break off; I mean the Advice of the *Anchoret*, and the *Britons* pursuing it, and the effect of all; which being too tedious to relate, I must refer you to the Author, *Bed. Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. cap. 2.* Now I cannot but think these overhard Conditions to be put upon them, not only to depart from the *Customs* and *Traditions*, which they had received with the *Faith*, but also to give up their *Liberty*. The third thing, which I thought might render this Agreement less feasible, was the Injuries done by the *Saxons* to the *Britons*. The design of *Austin* in seeking agreement with the *Britons*, was to get their assistance in converting the *Saxons*, who were then *Pagan Idolaters*. Now these *Saxons*, coming into this Island under pretence of Friendship as Succours, had driven the *Britons* out of their ancient Possessions and Habitations, and at that very time were

were farther pursuing that Injustice with all Fury imaginable: You can hardly think that the *Britons* could have any very hearty kindness for these Men. But suppose they had joined with him in Preaching the Gospel to them; the *Saxons*, in all likelihood, would have less heeded them than other Men, because they looked on them as Enemies; but if they had regarded their Preaching, do not you think it had been reasonable to have taught such boisterous Fellows something of Justice? And then the Doctrine of Restitution might have been apt to fall from the Mouths of such Sufferers, which in all likelihood would rather have provoked the *Saxons* to cut their Throats, than prevail'd with them to become Converts: So that the *Britons* were of all others the most unfit Persons to preach *Christianity* to the *Saxons*. All these things put together, and well considered, I think there is small reason to blame the *Britons*, for not complying with *Austin*; and therefore, with Mr. *Tallent's* good leave, I hope there is no occasion to *damn* them upon this account. But then what must become of *Austin* and his Followers? Truly let him give the Answer, who made the Question. He is no small Friend to *Schismatics*, and to any that are never so little of kin to them; and seeing I have done my endeavour to save *one half*, I hope he will save *the other*: But if he will not, I shall leave them to the Care of the *Romanists*, to whom they belong; for I do think my self obliged to be their *Advocate*.

(28.) There was no Age of the Church, wherein she did not suffer under *Persecutions*, or struggle with *Hereticks* and *Schismatics*, or both: But we are now got past any thing, wherein was the true relish of primitive Zeal and Purity; and are entering upon the Dregs of Time, wherein Affairs being managed by Ambition, Humour and Covetousness,

tuousness, Corruptions and Abuses, flowed in apace, and Matters grew continually from bad to worse. These indeed are Times fit to furnish our Author with Precedents, whose business it is to keep the same Wickedness and Troubles on foot; but since they teach us no good, and what hath been already said may be applied to them all, more or less, I shall run over them lightly, that I may hasten to his other way of Arguing. And now what if the *Gregorian Liturgy* was forc'd upon some Churches? Though Uniformity is a commendable thing, where the Matter is lawful and just; yet Custom, we say, is a second nature, and Men are apt to tug a little, rather than part with their old Usages; and perhaps in this Case they did not much mend themselves: But this was no Schism, unless every Contest, Brabble and Dispute must be one; but whatever it was, they submitted, and it was soon at an end. And I wish those were so, for whose continuance our Author is pleading; and then we might both give over writing, and the Schism might cease betwixt him and me; for so we may call this Dispute, after his way of Schism-making.

(29.) Our Author hitherto hath first told his *Tale*, and then put his *Question*; but now he begins with it first. *The Followers of Ignatius and Photius* (saith he, p. 56.) *were they all damn'd?* If they were, I know not what will become of *Ignatius* and *Photius* themselves, than whom that Age did not produce two greater Men. But to the matter, there was as deplorable a Schism in the Church of *Constantinople*, while these two Patriarchs were both living, as our Author could wish. Manifest Injustice was done to *Ignatius* by *Bordas*. But though Men grew cold and loose in those times, yet not so loose as in these; for many Persons of figure stood firm to *Ignatius*; and
Basilus.

Basilus did him Justice in restoring him, and yet to shew how willing he was to put an end to such a turbulent Schism, after the Death of *Ignatius*, he restored *Photius*; so that there was now no Pretender in being to keep up the Schism. But saith our Author, *Baronius* saith, the Followers of these two Patriarchs would not communicate with one another; but *Hody* saith, they did. And perhaps in different respects, both might say true. For while *Ignatius* and *Photius* were both living, those who were Followers of the one, could neither by their own Principles, nor the Laws of the Church, communicate with the other. But when *Ignatius* was dead, and *Photius* restored, and that Restoration confirm'd by a General Council of 383 Bishops, as even our Author tells us, what could hinder their Coalition and joint Communion? But I make it some doubt, whether our Author was altogether well advis'd, in calling that most Reverend Doctor by the bare Name of *Hody*, without any term of Respect. For he might have known, that he is so *dexterous*, shall I say, or *ambodexterous* a Person, that he can easily upon occasion change his *Scheme of Principles* according to the Times he lives in; but yet being a Man so excessively Humble and Meek, and free from all Conceitedness and vain Glory, perhaps he may put it up: However he should not have disobligh'd a Man, who, if the Times serve, may be willing enough to be his Friend; and the rather, because at present he hath borrowed what next follows from him; for which Reason I shall send him for an Answer to those, who have been so bold as to engage with that *Champion*.

(30.) And so next comes what he may well enough call, *The great Schism betwixt the Greek and the Latin Church*: For it divided the *East* and the *West*, hath lasted several hundred Years; and when there

there will be an end of it, God knows. It would be tedious, and indeed at this time impertinent, to give a full account of it; nor would a Volume contain it: I shall therefore only remark what I think to be to our purpose. And not to mention the particular things controverted between them, the Original of that fatal Schism, and in a great measure the Continuance, I think may be imputed to the Ambition of the two Patriarchs, but principally of the Bishop of *Rome*. I remember that some small time after the beginning of this Revolution, I heard a Reverend Doctor preach upon this Text, *My Kingdom is not of this World*, (John 18. 36.) and among other things, speaking of the extent of Christ's Kingdom, he told us, *That de jure it extended over all the World; but the Devil de facto had possessed himself of too great a part of it*. Whether the Pope do follow his Example, or be instigated by him, I will not pretend to determine: But this to me seems too evident, That by his letting in, and continuing several gross Errors under the pretext of *Infallibility*, by his reducing the *Episcopal* Authority to little more than a bare Name, by his new Articles of Faith, and asserting his Authority to make more, by his setting aside or mangling Christ's Institutions, and by other assumed and pretended Authorities, from which he will not in the least depart, he hath outdone the *black Gentleman* in assuming a Power over *Christ's Kingdom*: For the Institutions of Christ must not be observed without his Licence, and let *Christ* say what he will, you must not scruple obedience to the *Pope*. This is that which hath made that wide Breach irreconcilable; and this hath either caused or occasioned most, if not all, the wild Sects and abominable Schisms, now raging at this Day; though I do not intend hereby to apologize for any who have been the Broachers or

Promoters

Promoters of them. And is this now an Example to be brought to *alleviate* the Crime of *Schism*? Must the *Suffering* of the *Church* under so *tedious* and *malignant* a *Schism* be alledged to persuade us, that *Schism* is no *damnable Sin*; and thereby still to encourage the same *Schism*, and to promote others, and continue them to the end of the *World*? Has not the Man lost either his *Senses* or his *Conscience*, that can do thus? For what greater *Mischief* could he do to the *Church*, if he took counsel of *Hell*? For never any thing did the *Church* half so much *hurt* as the *Divisions* and *Factions* among *Christians*.

(31.) We have quickly travell'd from *Constantinople* to *Rome*; and whereas we retail'd out *Schisms* before, now we have them by wholesale. For saith he (p. 59.) *Some reckon about thirty Schisms of the Popes, two or three at the same time; especially one that began about the Year 1058, and lasted about seventy Years; and another about 1378, when one of the Popes sat at Avignon, which lasted about fifty Years.* I shall readily grant, that *Schisms* as well as other matters, are truly objected to the *Papists*; but whether there be not a vast difference between those *Schisms*, and that of the *Dissenters* from the *Church of England*, I will not dispute; for it is none of my business to defend them; let them stand up for their own Cause; they shall for me. But since our Author is pleased to interpose in their behalf, I have some little to say to him: And since he is so willing to save *Papists*, of all sorts and sizes, and will not allow any of them to be *damn'd*, though in the most *desperate Schisms*, I shall ask him, whether he have not discovered a Secret, which his Party will not think fit should be made known? I mean, that the *Dissenters*, at least the *Heads* of them, have a better opinion of, and are nearer of kin to the *Papists*, than they
are

are willing to be thought to be. If there be no danger of *Damnation* in the worst of that *Communion*, is not this a fair step towards *Rome*? But then, when the Men of your Party are angry with any Man of another Persuasion, what is the reason that they presently call them *Papists* or *Papistly affected*; and that with a design to represent them to the Rabble as the worst and most dangerous sort of Men? Have not you here voluntarily given a more ample Testimony of your being *Papistly affected*, than any of those whom you are so ready to *slander*? For certainly it is one thing in Compassion to hope well, and judge charitably in favour of them, who lie under invincible Ignorance; and another to plead in their behalf, who not only ought, but either do or may know better. For shame leave off these *Reproaches*, unless you could better defend your selves from that which you charge upon the *Innocent*. You are doing the Work of *Papists*, whilst you are endeavouring to pull down that Church, which is their greatest *Terror* and *Detestation* in these parts of the World: And if God in Judgment for our Sins should suffer you to compass your ends, what should hinder you and your Brethren from joining in their *Communion*, when you are so forward to secure *Salvation* to the greatest Offenders among them? Answer this with *Arguments*, not with *Railing* and *Reviling*.

(32.) In the next place a lofty Elogium is given of the *Albigenses* and *Waldenses*, whose Case seems to me to be much in the dark: For I have met with no original account of them, but what we have from their *Adversaries*, who may very well be suspected of unfair Dealing and Misrepresentation. Some indeed have made very favourable Constructions of them and their Opinions, which may be true for any thing I know; but I do not see that they
had

had any more certain grounds for it than Conjectures. I will not undertake to judge, who were *damn'd* or *fav'd* in this case : But if we consider the *Croisado's*, the *Blood* that was shed, and the *Desolation* that was made upon this account, I think it can be no proper Instance to persuade us, that *Schism* is such a *harmless Sin*, as this Author would persuade us. Indeed could Mr. *Tallents* persuade all Mankind to an *Indifferency* as to all *Communion's*, he might then procure an *Universal Peace* with respect to *Religion* ; but then to effect this, he must first prevail with Men to lay aside all *Conscience*. For how can a Man be said to have any *Conscience*, who sticks at nothing ? A Man cannot freely and heartily *join* in what he *disapproves* : If he would allow Men perpetually to act against their own *Sentiments*, yet *Conscience* continually flying in their Face would make them so *uneasie*, that they could not endure it. And therefore to bring this to pass, they must first make a thorough Conquest of *Conscience* ; and so we might procure a strange sort of *Peace* at the expence and loss of *Religion*.

(33.) Our Author is much obliged to the *Papists* for furnishing him with Materials for his new-fashion'd History ; and as if we had not had enough of them before, there comes now a long train of them again ; a parcel of *frantick Franciscans* ; then the *Jesuits* and *secular Priests* ; and again, the *Jesuits* and *Jansenists*, (p. 59, 60, 61.) Let him take them all, and make his best of them. For as to what can respect *Schism*, properly so called, he hath had his Answer already : And as for what respects Heats and Feuds among Men, who still continued in the same Communion, it deserves no Answer at all, because it is nothing to the purpose.

(34.) I have

(34.) I have seldom met with such an untoward sort of Impartiality: For that all alike may be exposed, next after the Popish come the Protestant Schisms, which he introduceth thus; *Among the Protestants, who have separated from Rome, there have been divers Schisms, to our exceeding Grief, and to the hinderance of Christ's blessed Gospel,* (p. 62.) If this Man believes himself, he hath a strong Faith; and perhaps a stronger, if he thinks that any other sensible Man can believe him. For would any Man in his right Wits, defend, encourage and promote that which is really *his exceeding Grief*? Or would any sincere Christian make it his business to plead for that which he acknowledgeth to be an *hinderance of Christ's blessed Gospel*? That which is the grief of good Men, and the hinderance of Christ's blessed Gospel, looks very like a *damnable Sin*: But whether *Damnation* be or be not in the case, seeing *Schism* is confess'd to be the *grief of Christians*, and the *hinderance of Christ's blessed Gospel*, certainly no Man, who would be thought to be a Christian, would undertake the defence of it, but rather judge it to be his business, by all honest means, agreeable with his Place and Station, to stifle and quell it.

(35.) If we make a search after these Protestants, I find our Author at present is so in love with *Schism*, that he will make us all *Schismatics*; though at another time he will tell you in behalf of his Party, that (such is the Blessing of a Brazen Face) they are *sure* they are no such Men. Here in the Van come the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, who *separate* from each other; and *many of them*, as he tells us, *in a high and fierce manner*. But whether they be *damn'd* or not, are they the better for this? To prevent these fierce Doings, you, according to your Scheme of Principles, would

would (at least occasionally) communicate with both. But then must not you with the *Calvinists* be fierce against the *Lutherans*, and with the *Lutherans* fierce against the *Calvinists*? For neither of these love *lukewarm Men*. But though you should do thus, yet when they had discovered you to be a *Jack-a-both-sides*, I am confident, that as fierce as they are against each other, they would both thus far agree, so as to turn you out; and then you might make a third sort of *Schismatick*, and mutiny by your self. These are followed by the *Remonstrants* or *Arminians*, who (as he-tells us) have set up distinct Churches or Meetings in Holland. I do not think it worth while to examine the Pretences, which he saith they make for it; but to me they seem to have had hard measure from the *Anti-remonstrants*, if it were only for this reason, that the *Arminians*, in matter of Discipline and Government, are as true-blew Protestants as any *Predestinarians* whatsoever; and upon that account alone, if no other, they might have afforded them the Right-hand of Fellowship. But whatever shall become of these *Arminians*, or whatever others may think of them, you ought not to have been so favourable to them. For when you would make a Man thoroughly odious, and represent him as so ill and dangerous a Person, that all ought to shun him, and avoid all converse with him, it hath been the Practice of your Party to brand him for an *Arminian*; and the common People have been possess'd, that they ought to have no more to do with such a one, than the *Devil*: And if it be so bad in *England*, pray how comes it to be so good in *Holland*?

(36.) The French *Huguenots* march up in their order next after the *Arminians*, but they are not impeached of *Schism*, nor any doubt made of their *Salvation*; but in their Defence the Charge

is drawn up against others; and the *English*, who were in *France*, are accused for saying, *They had no true Ministers, Sacraments, or Worship of God, because they had no Bishops*. And he cannot easily think well of my Lord Chancellor *Hide* for dropping this Saying in his Book against *Cressy*: *I will write nothing in defence of the Huguenots of France, of whose Communion I profess not my self to be*. And then comes the dangerous Question, which is constantly put, *Were these Gentlemen damn'd for that?* (p. 63.) This is an ugly *Imuendo*: The Case it self shall be try'd hereafter. In the mean time, I must needs say, that it would be very hard if these Gentlemen should be *damn'd* for being in the *right*. I have no mind to intermeddle with the French *Huguenots*, and perhaps we have not here so full and clear an account of the generality of them, as would be necessary for such a purpose: But of this I am sure, That some of them, who have come over hither, hold some very perverse and turbulent Opinions, and such as tend to dangerous Practices. But to let that pass, suppose a possibility of Salvation among the *Huguenots*, I believe you will comply with me in this for the sake of so *dear Friends*, because your self have already done no less for the *Romanists*: But what will this be to the purpose? *Possibility of Salvation* is a very slender *Invitation* to *Communion*. For many things are *possible*, which at the same time are very *improbable*. It is possible a Man may fall from a House without dashing out his Brains, or breaking his Bones; for it has been done; and yet I take it to be no strong Temptation to try the Experiment. Unless there be just reason for it, it may become a Man not to be forward in censuring *Persons*, though at the same time he do not think their *Communion* safe: And let Charity be as great as it will, and hope all that

that it can, yet it ought not to hinder me from taking care of my self, especially in the great Concern of *Eternal Salvation*; and therefore it will not warrant me to be of any Communion, of which I may be desirous to hope well: But here I must enquire for the *good old Way*, and look out for the sure and *certain Rule*, wherein my *Conscience* can acquiesce, and my *Judgment* be satisfied, that walking according to it, I shall certainly, and without all peradventure, be safe.

(37.) Although at present we are for *blending* of all *Communion*s, and leaving Men at liberty to be of this or that, or occasionally of as many as they will; yet we cannot forbear discovering, that we have an aking Tooth against *Bishops*, and that if we could once get them down, it would be a question, whether it would not be a *damnable Sin* to attempt to set them up again? For his next course of supposed *Schismatics* is serv'd up thus: *The English, that strive to set up Bishops and our Common Prayer in several places, where the Presbyterian or way of the French Protestants is establish'd by Law, as in Scotland and Holland, and other places; what shall we say of them? Are they or the Body of them Schismatics? and shall they be damn'd for that?* (p. 63.) I would desire you to put this Question to your Brethren in *Scotland*: I do not think they would make any scruple to *damn* them. For do not they positively affirm, that *Government* by *Bishops* is *Antichristian*? If that be not *damnable*, what is? Do they not call the *Common Prayer* by all the *fulsome loathsome Names* their wicked malicious Wit can invent? Did not Mr. *Meldrum*, in his Sermon before the High Commissioner, and the whole Parliament of *Scotland*, among other his wise Cautions, give them this Charge; *Beware of any thing that may weaken its* (i. e. the *Kirk's*) *Authority*;

thority, or obstruct its Exercise, or tend to reintroduce Prelacy, so justly declared in the Claim of Right, to be an insupportable Grievance in this Church? Have they not by Law made it Death for any Man there to speak or write against the Presbyterian Establishment? What could they do more against Murder or Adultery, or the most damnable Sin whatsoever? And if it be such a Sin, I do not find that those who are guilty of it, are much inclined to repent of it, which is the only way Mr. Tallents hath found out to save them: So that they are certainly cast, if those Men are in the right. For my part, I believe Presbyterians in England and Scotland to be the same. And though our Author, under the present Circumstances, seems so willing to save those in England, who are damn'd in Scotland, yet if they had the same Establishment the Scots have, which they are tugging hard for, I make no doubt but they would be the same Men, and be as bloody Enemies of Toleration, and as irreconcilable to what they would call Schism, as the Scots now are. For why should we think them other Men than they were heretofore? It is not yet past Memory of Man, that they play'd this part to the utmost of their power; and to say the truth, taking Schism in the general Notion, and not as particularly applied, if ever they wrote solidly and judiciously upon any point, it was upon that. But let us briefly examine the Charge it self. Presbytery's being established by Law, is made the Reason to prove it a Crime to strive to set up Bishops and Common Prayer in such place. But must we then submit to, and be of that Religion which is established by Law? If that be the reason of our being of any Religion, then there is an end of the Doctrine of the Cross, and all Suffering for Christ's sake. For that must be embraced as right, which the Civil Power establisheth; and then Mahometism and Paganism,

Paganism, where the *Law* of the *Land* is on their side, must be as good as *Christianity*. He is in a pitiful case, who hath nothing but *Humane Law* to plead for his *Religion*. Man hath not the disposal of *Heaven*. That *Religion*, which leads to *Salvation*, receives its *Virtue* and *Force* from the *Institution* of *Christ*, not from the *Contrivance* and *Authority* of *Man*. It's true, it is happy for that Nation, where the true *Religion* is established by *Law*, but the *Truth* and *Validity* of it is antecedent to any such legal Establishment, and it hath not its *Authority* from the *Civil Sanction*, tho' it is more comfortably exercised under its *Protection*: But if the *Civil Power* not only will not protect, but doth persecute the true *Religion*, we must not renounce it, unless we will forfeit our Title to *Heaven*. Thus your Plea of *Law* signifies little; and as for the *Truth* of your *Way*, it shall be try'd in the Conclusion.

(38.) The *Nonjurors*, whether they will or no, are next brought in among his *Herd* of *Schismatics*; and here a particular Charge is drawn up against Archbishop *Sancroft* for his Practice, and Mr. *Berkley* for something he wrote, which perhaps the *Nonjurors* may not disapprove: But he brings not the least shadow of an Argument against the Practice of the one, or the Writing of the other; but, as if his scornful Recital were a sufficient Refutation, he only adds in the close; *Thus, with what measure some mete to others, it is measured to them again. Shall these Nonjurors, or the Body of them, be damn'd for this?* (p. 64.) It was sober advice of the Son of *Syrach*, *Laugh no Man to scorn in the bitterness of his Soul; for there is one that humbleth and exalteth*, (Ecclus. 7. 11.) There has been Severity enough used to the *Nonjurors*; their *Estates* have been taken from them, their *Persons* exposed to the Mob, they are made the

Contempt and Scorn of Mankind, they suffer Injuries without redress; and if they must be *damn'd* hereafter, for being harass'd at this rate here, they have the heaviest fate of all Mankind. But as despicable as these Men are, yet there are some, who will *fear where no fear is*; and it looks as if some Men were afraid of even these helpless Creatures; and I am inclineable to think, that our Author is one of them, because he sets them out as if he had a mind to set the Government upon them, I shall not so far concern my self as to undertake their defence; but I hope I may be allowed to do them that Justice, as to relate two things, which I find they unanimously agree to say for themselves. 1st, That an *Oath*, if not taken in *Truth*, in *Judgment* and *Righteousness*, is one of the most dreadful and dangerous things in the World. For when he swears with his Hand upon the *Gospel*, he renounceth his Right to any thing contained in that *Book*, and invokes *God* to deprive him of all *Interest* in *Jesus Christ*, all *Helps* from the means of *Grace*, all *Benefits* of the *blessed Gospel*; that instead of *Comforts*, he would load him with all *Curses* here, and make him eternally miserable hereafter; if what he *say* be not *true*, or he do not *perform* what he *promise*. A Life void of all true Comfort here is bad, but eternal Damnation is infinitely worse. And therefore, say they, if a Man have any doubt or scruple in this case, it were better for him to suffer any thing from Man, rather than incur the heavy Curse of God, and pronounce his *Damnation* with his own Mouth. 2^{dly}, They say they cannot approve of *Lay Deprivations*; because the Consequence hereof must unavoidably lead to downright *Erastianism*; and then your business is not to enquire what Religion *Christ* left, but what the *Civil Magistrate* will allow; and so we may be in danger of losing our
holy

holy Religion it self. But though they cannot submit to these things, yet they say, they are willing to live quietly, if they may be suffer'd so to do : But if the Government think that they have not suffer'd enough already, they must be content to suffer more ; they have no other Remedy, but to appeal and apply themselves to God.

(39.) He hath reserved his *Dearly beloved Brethren* to come up last in the Rear ; in hope, I suppose, that they might come off with dry Heads, when the rest had stood the brunt of the Battel. But the Cause being theirs, I think they ought to have fought it themselves ; and if all those *Auxiliaries* had been left out, I think there had been no harm done. Because they are his *Protestant Dissenters of England*, with whom our present business is, and among other Questions he puts with respect to them, this is most agreeable to his former Position : *Whether they are in as great danger of Damnation as moral Heathens, or those that live in Murther or Adultery?* (p. 65.) Now this is what I have all along told you I intend to bring to a fair Tryal at the last ; and therefore I desire I may be excused, if I engage not in it at present. And now I was in hope I had done with his Historical part, but I find my self deceived. For, that he might be sure to give us enough of it, he makes a Recapitulation of the whole, and at every turn makes his usual unsavory Question, Were these, those, or the other *damn'd*? No reasonable Man, I hope, will expect that I should repeat all my Answers: But that the Author may not think himself altogether slighted, I shall give him one general Answer, and that, I hope, will prove sufficient. *Good Examples* are like *Light-houses* or *Land-marks*, which upon occasion not only *instruct* us how to avoid the *Danger*, but also *direct* us how to

steer our *Course*: But *bad Examples* are like *Cyres*, which, if heark'd to, will bewitch and transform us into *Brutes*; and instead of affording us any means to recover our selves, will make us daily worse. Our Author hath raked together all the Dirt and Filth of former and later Times, and to what purpose, unless to make us more filthy still, and that we may exceed in Wickedness and Troublesomeness all that went before us? It is not a small number of *Schisms* which he hath reckon'd up; and to what other end, but to save all the *Schismaticks*? For he most outrageously cries out against any that shall dare to pronounce them *damm'd*. And to what end are all these *say'd*, but to confirm all our present *Schismaticks* in their froward doings, to keep all our *Schisms* on foot, and encourage their daily increase? This is the manifest Design and plain Consequence of all his Reasoning. Now, because he likes this so well, I will give him two or three parallel Instances, and make the like Inferences, and let him tell us how he likes them. A Man robs upon the *Road*, is taken, condemn'd and executed; but by God's Blessing upon some faithful Minister's pains, is first made sensible of his *Sin*, heartily *repents*, and to his power makes *satisfaction*; shall this Man be *damm'd*? No: Therefore you may rob upon the *Higb-way*. Again, One Man kills another; but when he has done, he has no quiet in his Mind, *Bloodguiltiness* terrifies his *Conscience*, he bewails his Condition, is truly sorrowful for his *Sin*, and would give the World, if it were in his power, that the fact had not been committed, or could be undone again; but for all that, he shall be *hang'd*; but shall he be *damm'd* too? No: Therefore take Courage, you may commit *Murder*. Once more, and I have done; A boisterous Fellow is found guilty of a *Rape*, but before he suffers

suffers the Law, his *Sin* and the *danger* of it is so effectually represented to him, that he bitterly *be-
moans* himself, and gives all the Testimonies of a *sincere Repentance*, for that and all other Sins; shall this Man be *damn'd*? No: Therefore you may give the loose to your *Lusts*, and *ravish Women*. These are such abominable Inferences, as even an *immoral Heart* would blush to own; and yet this is the direct Consequence of his *Doctrine*, with this only difference, which makes it rather worse, That in tenderness to his *Schismatick* he would not only save him from *Damnation* hereafter, but he would not have him in the least *punish'd* here. This is very unbecoming any Man, much more him, who will call himself a *Minister of the Gospel*. For whatever is our *Charity*, we ought not to speak or treat so of any *Sin*, as to give *encouragement* to it. As for those that are in their *Graves*, what have we to do with their *Persons*? But whatever becomes of them, it is certain we ought not to follow them in their Faults, as we are taught here. And as for those, who are *living*, if any of them live in a course of *Sin*, it would ill become us to say, *Go on, you may be sav'd*; but we rather ought to tell such, that they are in a *state of Dam-
nation*; for to sooth them in *Sin*, is the greatest *Cruelty*; but to make them so sensible of it, as to forsake it, is the greatest *Charity*; and nothing more likely to awaken them, than to represent to them the Danger: And yet we cannot use our Author's huffing Phrase of them, and say they are actually *damn'd*. For as yet they have the means to escape, and may do so, if they make a right use of them: But whether they escape or not, the Crime is to be condemn'd, and we ought not to give the least encouragement to that *Sin*, which is the *Pest* of the *Church*, and makes Men the *Troublers of Israel*, which is always the effect of

Schism. *Damnation* (saith our Author, p. 68.) is a terrible thing, to be driven from the presence of the Lord, and be cast into everlasting Fire, prepared for the Devil and his Angels, by the righteous Judgment of God, to be tormented there for ever; how dreadful is this? Nothing can be more true, and I wish all Men would well consider it, and lay it to heart; but then I doubt not, but that hereafter I shall make it appear, that *Schism* is a *damnable Sin*, tending to bring Men into this terrible dreadful Condition; and if he have a mind to persuade Men to run the hazard of it, he may; I cannot help it, though truly sorry for it: But if I should do so, I fear, that would be a *damnable Sin* in me: And this I desire him seriously to think of, as well for others sake as his own. And so I leave his unhappy History, to examine his other Topicks in their course.

C H A P. VI.

The Question not fairly stated, and how it ought to have been, §. 1. St. Cyprian cleared from the Slander cast on him, 2. How far the Fathers may be rely'd on, and the two Archbishops Whitgift and Laud vindicated, 3. The Author's Concession, and impertinent Citation of St. Augustine, 4. Whether St. Cyprian be in this Case mistaken, and Schismaticks in or out of the Church, 5. St. Augustine, Optatus and St. Chrysostom vindicated, 6, 7, 8. The rest of the Fathers cleared from Aspersions, 9. His ridiculous summing up his Evidence, with his Threatning at the end of it, 10.

(1.) **T**HE Question, as our Author states it, was, *Whether Schism be as great a Sin as Murder or Adultery?* This is an Artifice to perplex the Dispute, and confound the Reader; and at this time, and in this case, not a fair state of the Question between us; for whether it be, or be not so great a Sin, what he designs thereby to prove will not thence follow, viz. *That Schism is either none or next to no Sin, and Men may be encouraged to live in it.* The Question therefore fairly put, had been this, *Whether Schism be a damnable Sin or not?* And if it prove to be such, then the Consequence had been evident, that those who live in *Schism* are in a *state of Damnation*. I confess, I cannot thoroughly approve of the *Romanists* distinction of Sin into *Mortal* and *Venial*, and much less of the use which they make of it; but certainly there is a great difference between those Sins which are said *vastare conscientiam*, and those *quotidiane incursonis*. For I cannot think any Man so severe, as to alledge, that those scarce discernable Failings, which

which through inadvertency the best of Men oft stumble upon in this imperfect state, do render their Condition as dangerous as gross and known Crimes. And if Schism shall appear to be in the rank of these *great and gross Sins*, whether it be as great a Sin as *Murder* or *Adultery*, or not, it is sufficient to make the state of that Man, who lives in it, *damnable*. But this course being not very agreeable with our Author's design, he avoids it; and I must be content to follow, as he will lead me. To prove, that the Comparison between *Schism*, and *Murder*, and *Adultery*, will not hold, he lays down for his next ground-work this Assertion:

This false Opinion is grounded only on some Passages in Cyprian, and other of the Fathers, (p. 69.)

It had been much fairer to have proved this Opinion false, than thus to have taken it for granted. For this is to raise a Prejudice against a thing, while it is upon Tryal; and to do as the Man did by his Dog, who wrongfully gave him an ill Name, which cost him his Life. And I think there is a little reason to say, that the Opinion is *false*, because grounded on the *Fathers*, as that his Assertion is *true*, because it is the Opinion of Mr. *Talents*: For certainly their Authority may ballance his. But he offers to prove what he says: But then what is it he proves? If he prove it to be grounded on the *Fathers*, I readily grant it; but that doth not prove it to be *false*. He must therefore farther prove it to be false, if he will do any thing to the purpose: And here, I doubt, he will fail us. But that he may now seem at least to do something extraordinary, he tells us, he *shall answer it in general, and in particular*.

(2.) It being a common Practice with these sort of Men to catch at scraps and ends of the Fathers, thereby to misrepresent both Them and Truth, before

before I meddle with his Generals and Particulars, I think it convenient to wipe off a Scandal, which to help his cause he hath cast upon St. Cyprian, and makes St. Jerom the Author of it. Hierom (saith he) censuring other ancient Writers, in a sort, among them taxes Cyprian as if he had scarcely touch'd the Scriptures; saying, *De Scripturis Divinis nequaquam differuit.* This he plainly speaks with a design to represent St. Cyprian as little read and unskilful in the Scriptures, and consequently an incompetent Judge in this Case; and thus in the same Breath abuseth both St. Cyprian and St. Jerom. The truth is thus, Paulinus (afterwards Bishop of Nola) had wrote to St. Jerom, among other things, for his Advice; the good old Man was not a little pleased, and returns an Answer full of many kind Complements, and in conclusion pathetically exhorts him to the study of the Holy Scriptures; and then, shewing how some of the Fathers might be more or less useful to him in that matter, he gives this Character of St. Cyprian, *Beatus Cyprianus instar fontis purissimi, dulcis incedit, & placidus; & cum totus, sit in exercitatione virtutum, occupatus persecutionum angustiis, de Scripturis Divinis nequaquam differuit.* (Ep. 13. ad Paulinum.) The plain sense of which is, That though St. Cyprian was a sweet and clear Writer, yet Persecutions raging in his time, he was so wholly taken up in penning such Exhortations, Disputations, or Discourses, as were necessary for the preservation of his Flock, to hold up their Hearts, and keep them from falling away, that he had not leisure to write any Dissertations or Commentaries on holy Scripture. But this speaks nothing against his ability to have done it, but seems rather to bewail his want of opportunity and leisure. And must this be strained to make him an Ignoramus? Those, who with an honest Heart impartially read St. Cyprian, will

will find him to be well exercised in the *Scriptures*, and a fit Person to have wrote upon them, had not the heat of Persecution forced him otherwise to employ his time. But there are a sort of Men, who make no Conscience whom they slander, so they can serve their Cause; and they have found so much wicked advantage in it, that I fear they will never leave it.

(3.) Having done Justice to that blessed Martyr, I now come to try the strength of his Arguments: And, *in general*, he tells us, That *the Sayings of the Fathers are not a sufficient ground for us to build upon*. To rely solely upon them in every thing, is to attribute to them too much: But I hope this doth not hinder, but that they may speak Truth. I shall hereafter prove the Truth of this Doctrine, both from *Scripture* and the *Nature* of the Thing; and then, if we take in the concurrent Testimonies of the *Fathers* to vouch the same, I hope it may be neither Prejudice nor Discredit to be found in so *good Company*. But he hath something like Reason to offer against the *Fathers*: And first he tells us, That *'tis only the holy Scripture, and what may be truly deduced from it, that we can safely build our Faith and Practices upon*. Be it so: But then if you please to look again into the *Fathers*, you will find that they frequently and plentifully prove the truth of what they wrote in this matter from *Scripture*; and therefore by your own Argument you must acknowledge them to be in the *right*, unless you can prove that they have mistaken *Scripture*, which you do not. For what you say in the next place, that *they may err*, is nothing to the purpose: For if every one that *may err*, *must err*, we are in a most lamentable and wretched Condition. I do not think Mr. *Tallents* and his *Dissenters* will pretend to *Infallibility* more than the *Fathers*; and then
it

it will be as good an Argument to say, that *he* and his *Dissenters* are in the *wrong*, because they may *err*, as to say so of the *Fathers*: And then, I doubt, his Friends will tell him, that his Argument proves a great deal too much. The truth is, the best of Men on Earth are fallible, and many are often actually mistaken; but if this must be allowed for a good Inference, *That Men who may err must err*, we can then have no certainty either of *Right* or *Fact*, and all the World may turn *Scepticks*. You might therefore have spared your Authorities of as fallible Men as the Fathers, to prove, that the Fathers may err, and sometimes actually have err'd; for it nothing affects this Cause; unless you prove, that they have err'd in this particular: And this you are so far from doing, that the greatest part of those, your own Vouchers, if need require, will be ready to bear witness for the *Fathers* in this matter against you. It was not therefore well advised to bring such Evidence into the Court: I am sure Two, whom you have forc'd to give in Testimony, which looks something slanting your way, were as stout Champions against *Schism* as any this Church hath produced. Archbishop *Whitgift* was a learned, judicious, and prudent Man; yet you are so bold as to make him betray his own Cause, when he was writing against the greatest and hottest *Schismatick* of his Age: And truly I think it were not much disparagement to you, if you owned *T. Cartwright* for the *Father* and *Founder* of your Order here in *England*; he was a Man of great Learning, but of a true *Presbyterian Spirit*, *baugbry*, *virulent* and *bitter*; and this enhanced by being *disgusted*. But whereas the Archbishop will not allow him to call him back to the *Primitive Church*; he means not of those times, when the Purity of Doctrine was preserved by regular Government and Discipline: For
thereto

thereto he is always ready to appeal; but he means the very beginnings of the Christian Church, when things were *in fieri*, and matters were not yet brought to what they ought to be, and were designed to be: And to bring back a formed settled Church to such a state, were the same thing, as to reduce a Man, at his compleat and full growth, to the condition of an Infant or Embryo; which indeed would be to destroy him: And therefore the Archbishop had a great deal of Reason to say what he did; nor doth his Saying give the least countenance to Schism. Nor will Archbishop Laud do him any better service. I cannot imagine how all on the sudden he should become your *Friend*, whom your *moderate Brethren*, the *pious Schismatics* of his time, did judge so great and dangerous an *Enemy*, that they thought not themselves *safe*, till he was made a *Sacrifice* to their implacable *Malice*. As for what he saith concerning a *plain honest Donatist*, *holding the Foundation*, and not knowing his *Schism*, — but misled by the *Current of the Time*; yet not *supinely*, but with *diligence to know the Truth*; not *pertinaciously* or *uncharitably*, not *factionously*, but with *sincere endeavours of Union of all Christians in Truth and Peace*, (p. 73.) This (I say) none of us will disown; for we are as willing as that blessed Martyr to distinguish between the *Deceivers*, and the *Deceived*; between the simply *Erroneous*, and fierce *Propagators of Errors*. But then if such an one be saved, it is not for being a *Schismatick*, much less for being *Seditious*, *Factionous*, and causing *Disturbance and Troubles* where-ever they come; but it is for holding the *Foundation*, for behaving himself like a meek and quiet Christian; for his preparation of *Mind to embrace the Truth*, when made appear to him, and for his sincere endeavours to come to the knowledge of it. — He would not be a *Schismatick*, if he understood the
mistake;

mistake; it is pity such a one should be lost, who doth what he can to get into the right way: For he may be reckoned among the *invincibly Ignorant*; and such an one, a learned and moderate *Romanist* will not condemn; though they are generally so uncharitable, as to pass Sentence of *Damnation* upon all whatsoever, who are not of their *Communion*. God hath obliged us to the ordinary Means and standing Rules, in the use of which alone we have sure hope of finding Mercy; but he hath not so ty'd up himself, but that he may have a reserve of uncovenanted and extraordinary Mercies for such, who hold the Faith, and soberly and sincerely search after Truth, but by the Iniquity of the Times, or being unfortunately placed, are misled in the simplicity of their Souls. But what is this to those, who shut their Eyes against the Truth? who account you their Enemy, because you tell them the Truth? who are so bloody-minded in their way, as to think it doing God good service to kill those who are not of their way, and call *Murder* or *Rapine* the carrying on the *Work of the Lord*? This hath been their Trade: And though at present the common Cry is, *Moderation, Moderation*; yet it is meer *scaffolding* and covering their design, that they may once more get it into their power to be at their old Trade again. I cannot say what Mercy they may find, who are purely deceived; but this I am sure of, that it were much better for them, if they were not so: And therefore this can be no warrant for any sort of *Schism*, much less any encouragement to boisterous and outrageous *Schismatics*.

(4.) From his *General*, we now come to his *Particular Answer*: And it is well he call'd it so; for they look so like one and the same, that if he had not told it me, I should scarce have found out the difference.

difference. I shall pass by at present those Fathers, who (as he saith) *speake only in General*, and content my self with these four, which he freely gives up to us, viz. *Cyprian, Augustine, Optatus, and Chrysostom*. These are no contemptible Men, but such whose Authority will at any time go as far as *Mr. Tallent's*, unless he can either bring better Authority, or good Reason to invalidate it. I need not trouble the Reader with what he cites from them in relation to this Opinion, because he acknowledgeth it to be on our side; and if there had been any need of it, I think that more full and ample Testimonies might have been cited from them. Our only business then here is to enquire what he brings against their Authority. And first he sets up *St. Augustine* against *St. Cyprian*, who in answer to *Cresconius*, the Donatist alledging the Authority of *St. Cyprian's* Epistle to *Jubajanus*, says thus: *I am not bound by the Authority of that Epistle, because I look not on Cyprian's Epistles as Canonical Writings, but judge them by the Canonical; and what in them agrees with the Authority of the divine Scriptures, I receive to his praise; and what agrees not with it, by his good leave, I reject.* (p. 75.) Very good. *St. Augustine* hath given the same advice as to his own Writings; and thus far you might have produced him against himself, if there had been occasion. But his Testimony is brought in here very impertinently: For *St. Augustine* doth not reject *St. Cyprian's* Judgment in the present Case, but receives it to his praise; and by your own Confession they are agreed in this matter: And if you please to look into them again, you will find, that they both found their Opinion upon the *Authority of the divine Scriptures*. *St. Augustine* is therefore so far from setting aside *St. Cyprian's* Authority in this case, that he rather confirms it.

(5.) But

(5.) But that he might effectually do St. Cyprian's work, who is the great Eye-sore and Grievance of all *Schismatics*, he plainly tells you, That Cyprian is grossly mistaken, in thinking *Schismatics* were out of the Church; hereupon he concluded, they had no Grace, no Charity, nor could be saved, and that Baptism administred by them was null. And then he tells us somewhat more than is true of Pope Stephen's doings, as I have already proved; and talks of *Papists* receiving *Protestants*, and *Protestants* *Papists*, without *Rebaptization*; to which is added a large Citation from Mr. Hooker against the Opinion of the *African Bishops*, (p. 76 and 77.) The greatest part of this is to little or no purpose: For the the Case of *Rebaptization* doth not lie before us; nor is it any part of our Controversie, that I know of; it will be time enough to answer that when it is charg'd upon us. But whether *Schismatics* be in or out of the Church, is, I confess, a very material Question: Because, if they appear to be out of the Church, it will go a great way towards ending the present dispute; for then their Case will be as bad, if not worse, than *Murtherers* or *Adulterers*, who, unless actually excluded, are yet under the Power and Influence of the means of Grace, and of the *visible Body*. If the Notion of *Schism* be taken in its utmost latitude, then it may sometimes be said, that there are *Schisms* in the Church; as when Men, who are of the Communion, out of a Spirit of Pride, Peevishness and Contention, raise Parties and Factions among themselves, and thereby imbitter each other's Spirits, and cause continual Quarrels and Troubles: And these Divisions have a great tendency towards, and aptitude to beget that which is properly called *Schism*; but till it come to that, if you will call such *Schismatics*, they are in the Church. But in St. Cyprian's Notion and Sense of *Schism*, *Schismatics*

• L

ricks are out of the *Church*; and if *Mt. Tallents* had well considered what that holy Father meant by *Schism*, he (I hope) would not have been so rash and rude as to say, that he was *grossly mistaken*. For *St. Cyprian* speaks of those, who separated from the *true Communion*, and set up *opposite Communions*. Now no Man can cut himself off from the *true Communion*, and still continue a *Member* of the *Church*: Because he cannot be a *Member* but by being admitted into that *Communion*, nor continue a *Member* longer than he remains of it. Now there are two ways whereby a Man may cease to be a *Member* of the *Church*, either by his *own Act*, or by the *Act* of the *Church*; by his *own Act*, when he breaks off from the *true Communion*, and renounceth the *Body*; by the *Act* of the *Church*, when by an authoritative just Sentence he is cast out of the *Church*: Either of these seem to work the same effect as to dismembring. But if a Man's Case be worse, or more desperate in one of these Cases than the other, it is certainly when it is done by a Man's *own Act*, and not the *Church's*; as it is much better for a Man to suffer Death, whether rightfully or wrongfully, by the hand of another, than for him to cut his own Throat. He that by his *own Act*, in separating from the Church, dismembers himself, in the Language of *St. Paul*, is said to be *αὐτοκατάρατος*, *Self-condemned*, (*Tit. 3. 11.*) Not that he with his own Mouth formally pronounceth the sentence of Condemnation, either of himself, his Doctrines, or his Practices; but that, whether he owns it or not, his *own Act* doth unavoidably condemn him; by departing, he hath cut off himself, and is no longer a *Member*: There needs no Sentence of the *Church* to pass upon him, he hath done his own Work. On the other hand, when this is done by the *Act* of the Church, then in the Language of the same Apostle, it is called *a delivering to Satan*,

Satan, (1 Cor. 5. 5. and 1 Tim. 1. 20.) And such a Person, in the Language of St. *John*, is said to be of the *Synagogue of Satan*, (Revel. 2. 9.) This is the Case and Condition of such *Schismatics*, against whom St. *Cyprian* writes. And now let our Author tell me, how he, who is *self-condemned*, who is *delivered over to Satan*, who is of the *Synagogue of Satan*, and consequently a *Member of the Devil*, can be a *Member of the Church*? But still there is a greater Authority than all these, even that of our Blessed Saviour, who hath commanded us to rank these sort of Men with *Heatbens and Publicans*, (Mat. 18. 17.) and if *Heatbens* be in the Church, I know not who are out of it. If this should prove to be the Case of the *Dissenters*, I pray God they may so consider of it, and lay it to Heart, that by a timely Repentance, and return from whence they are fallen, they may recover out of so dangerous a Condition. Whether it is or not, I shall put it upon Tryal in the Conclusion, though I am sensible it will enrage many, and that I must expect ill Treatment for it: But I think it more Honesty and Charity to let Men see their danger, than to lull them asleep in it. At present, I have no more to do, than to vindicate St. *Cyprian* from being grossly mistaken in this matter; which, if I have done, the gross mistake will rebound back upon another.

(6.) The next *Father* he gives to us is St. *Augustine*, whom he cites so fully to our purpose, that some of his Brethren may think he had better let it alone. But then he serves St. *Augustine* just as he did St. *Cyprian*, *His Writings* (saith he, p. 79.) *are not Canonical*. I grant it; but yet I think them as *Canonical* as the Writings of Mr. *Tallents*; and if St. *Augustine* might err, so may Mr. *Tallents*; and if this Argument be good for any thing, it will be as good against the one as the other. But

(Smith he) *we judge of them* (i.e. his Writings) *by the Canonical* (Scriptures.) If you had done so, it had been to the purpose; but you do no such thing here: When you do it, you shall have an Answer; you ought not to expect it before. He adds farther, *That some have been so bold as to write against him in the great points of Grace and Predestination, — and such cannot justly object him to us, if we modestly differ from him in this.* Why not? If they prove him mistaken in that, and right in this, surely there is a difference. But there is another Reason why they may object it, notwithstanding their excepting against him in that particular; which is, that St. *Augustine* hath not that concurrent consent of the Fathers in that Opinion as in this. But be it as it will, we do not put the Issue of our Cause barely on St. *Augustine's* Judgment, though we think it no prejudice to it to have him on our side. Lastly, Whereas St. *Augustine* wrote against the Donatists, he tells us, *It's plain the Dissenters in England vastly differ from the Donatists, both in their Principles and Practices.* Not so very vastly, good Sir! You say, and that truly, *That the Donatists said the Church of Christ was only amongst them;* but this, you say, is a grievous Sin, *the Dissenters abhor it.* Are you sure your Brethren are all of the same Mind? Or may not this be only an *occasional Doctrine* to serve the present Scene of Affairs? I am sure it hath been otherwise; and if it be not so still, you are not the same Men you were. Indeed they endeavoured all they could to keep it as an *Arcanum*, and buz it about among their own Party; but either through Indiscretion, or in heat of Dispute, or in the business of making a Proselyte, it hath been blab'd out. I do not say, you agree with the *Donatists* in every thing, tho' in many things I could draw an ill-favour'd parallel between you; but it is sufficient for us, that
you

you agree thus far with them, as to *separate* from the *true Communion*, and set up in *opposition* to it; which was the ground of St. *Augustine's* Censure, and makes it equally strong against you as against them; and so I leave you to defend your self a little better against him, than you have done.

(7.) Against *Optatus* he hath only a flash, which will scorch none but himself and his Party. The Note of *Rigaltius* seems to promise something, which may then be answered, when he performs it. All you say else is this: 'Tis plain to compare all *Schisms* in the Church to the highest degree of the Rebellion of *Corah, Dathan and Abiram*, is a high flight of *Rhetorick*, tho' far from true Reason, (p. 82.) If you can clear this Answer from Sham and Untruth, you may glory in the *Rhetorick* of it as much as you please. *Optatus* compares the *Schism* of his time; not all your sorts of *Schism*: For though it is your main business to make nothing of *Schism*, yet at the same time you make more sorts of *Schism* than ever any Man did. If *Optatus's* Comparison betwixt *Corah* and the *Schismatics* of his time do hold, then his Reasoning is true; and if it be applicable to our *Dissenters*, then his Testimony is good for us. Now to vindicate him from what you have said against him, I shall need no more but to set down what you have cited from him, thus: *Optatus mentions Persons guilty of three Crimes, an Idolater, a Parricide, and a Schismatick. The Ninivites*, saith he, *who were Idolaters, upon a short Repentance were pardon'd. Cain, guilty of Murder, was not kill'd; but Corah, Dathan and Abiram, who rose up against Moses, were swallow'd up alive. God, to whom Schism is hateful, did that against the Schismaticks, which he did not against the Sacrilegious, and the Murderer of his Brother*, (p. 81.) Now what flight of *Rhetorick* soever there may be in this, I appeal to any Man,

whether every word of it be not downright matter of Fact, and plain Truth? And how comes that to be *far from true Reason*? If you reason no better, your Authority will quickly be small, though your Confidence be never so great. And here I think it is not unworthy our notice, that St. *Cyprian* observes in this Case, That though *Corab* and his Accomplices opposed *Moses* and *Aaron*, and claimed that Authority which God had not given them, but had to another, yet they had not then separated from the *Communion* of the *Congregation of Israel*; in which our *Dissenters* have gone beyond them; which I wish they may consider.

(8.) St. *Chrysostom* is the last of the four, whom he declares against for being an Enemy to *Schismatics*; and against him he saith so little, that he had better have said nothing at all. It is no more but this, That at that time *Theophilus* held a Council against him to depose him. And what is this to the Truth or Falshood of St. *Chrysostom's* Opinion concerning Schism? If *Theophilus* did him wrong, was it not lawful for him to endeavour to do himself right? Suppose it made him somewhat warm, yet in course it must also make him more wary; because he knew so great and dangerous an Adversary lay at catch for all advantages against him. He was not condemn'd for his Opinion of *Schism*; for that was never condemn'd in the ancient Church: And indeed the Proceedings against him were so very foul, that *Theodoret* professeth himself ashamed to relate them; he doth not mention the Crimes he was accused of, but he plainly saith they were false, and that the proceedings against him were so Clandestine, that *Chrysostom* at his return pleaded in defence of his discharge of his Office, notwithstanding their Sentence, μήτε δικάσαθς, μήτε ἢ γραφῶν ἐπακῆσαι, μήτε ἀπολογισθῶν ποιήσαθς, μήτε μὴ καὶ ἀκριβῶς παρῶν, (lib.5. c.34.)

i. e. That it could not be said to be properly and validly a Judgment against him, because he neither heard what was laid to his Charge, nor was admitted to make his Defence, but was condemn'd being absent. This was very lewd Treatment; and I think Mr. Tallents hath not done much better by him, who makes it an Argument that we should not believe him, because he was thus notoriously abused. This is to do *Cbrysoftom* double wrong, but will never convince any Man of the fallhood of his Opinion, unless he be so monstrously credulous, as entirely to pin his Faith on another's Sleeve, and be led away at every turn with an *ipse dixit*. Thus by Confession we have four Fathers for us, against whom nothing to the purpose has been objected: I shall now enquire what is become of the rest.

(9.) Having thus lightly shuffled away these four great Fathers, he next triumphantly insults over those, who (as he saith, p. 83.) *being at a loss as to the Scriptures, make a great bustle with the Fathers (though some such Talkers have little read them) to amuse and baffle their Opposers*. For my part, I am no great Admirer of such *Bustlers*, especially if the Cause do not require it: But then, I must confess, that I have not a better Opinion of those who read the Fathers with a design to pervert them, and wrest and squeeze their Words to make them speak contrary to their Intentions: And whether you are guilty or not in this point, shall now be tryed. To this end I must go back again to those *Fathers*, whom you have mentioned as favourable to your Cause. Whether those *Fathers* have compared *Schism* with *Murther* or *Adultery*; I think to be a needless Enquiry; because it is sufficient for us, that they account it a *beinous Crime* and *damnable Sin*. And first you introduce *St. Jerom* taxing *St. Cyprian*, to which an Answer

hath been already given. But if you will let St. *Jerom* speak his own mind, I doubt you will think him a *High-Flyer*. For, speaking of *Hereticks*, not for their *Heresie*, but for their *Schism*, he saith thus : Sit una Eva mater cunctorum viventium ; & una Ecclesia, parens omnium Christianorum : Sicut illam maledictus Lamech in duas divisit Uxores : Sic hanc hæretici in plures Ecclesias lacerant ; quæ juxta Apocalypsim Johannis Synagogæ magis Diaboli appellandæ sunt, quam Christi conciliabula, (*Ep. 11. ad Ageruchiam.*) i.e. *Let one Eve be the Mother of all Living ; and one Church the Parent of all Christians : As cursed Lamech divided that into two Wives, so Hereticks rent this into more Churches, which according to the Revelations of St. John are rather to be called Synagogues of the Devil, than Assemblies of Christ.* You say, you heartily approve of what Clemens writes in his *Epistle to the Corinthians* : Yet his whole design is against *Schism*, though wrote in a melting Style, and with a most sweet and Christian Spirit : Nor doth he forbear to say, *πάσα σάσις καὶ πᾶν σχίσμα βδελυκτὸν ὑμῖν* . i.e. *Let all Sedition and all Schism be an abomination to you,* (cap. 2.) And farther makes it the Sin of *Korah*, which so angered you, that you exclaim against it as far from true Reason, though you were wiser than to offer to prove what you said. *Καλὸν γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ ὁμολογεῖσθαι περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἢ (κληρώσθαι τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, καθὼς ἐκκληρώθη ἡ καρδία τῶν σαζούντων πρὸς τὴν διεραπνοῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ Μωσέως, ὃν τὸ πρῶμα πρὸς δὴλον ἐγήμθη, κατέβησθαι γὰρ εἰς αἶδ' ἑὼντες, καὶ θάνατον κατέπιεν αὐτοῖς* . i.e. *It is better for a Man to confess his Sin, than to harden his Heart ; as their Heart was hardened who rose up against Moses the Servant of the Lord, whose Condemnation was openly ; for they went alive down to Hell, and Death swallowed them up,* (cap. 15.) Your next Friend is *Irenæus*, from whom you

translate

translate what you please, and then cry out, *Exceeding well spoken; who can chuse but like this?* But if you like it, you ought not to like your own ways; for it is full in your Teeth, and expressly condemns them. But if what you have cited be not plain enough, not above two Lines farther you might have found this: *Nulla enim ab eis tanta potest fieri correptio, quanta est Schismaticis pernicies, (lib. 4. cap. 62.) i. e. No Punishment so great can be inflicted on those (i. e. Schismatics) as can answer the Mischiefs or Plague of Schism.* Yet he, who saith this, was so peaceable a Man, that nothing but the malignant Nature of the thing could have drawn such a Censure from him. Some other *Fathers* you mention, who, you tell us, *say the like.* But then we must take it upon trust; for not one word do you cite from them: And I am not very forward to believe, that you would have been so disserviceable to your Cause, as to cite *Fathers*, whose Testimony upon examination makes against you, if you could have found any who would speak for you, and therefore till you shall make them speak out of their own Mouths, not yours, I shall not trouble you with any farther *bustle* about them: Only I desire this may be observed, that *Heresies* and *Schisms* began very early; and none could better know the *Judgment* of the *Apostles* in this matter, than those who were nearest to their times; nor can we expect a more faithful Declaration of it, than from them who were either *Martyrs* or *Confessors* for the Faith, as well as of *undeniable Abilities*; and still the nearer they are to the *Apostles* times, the more warm and watchful are they against *Schism*: Nor can you produce one *Father*, who hath wrote of this matter, who hath not passed such a deserved Censure upon *Schism*, as according to your Principles ought to be thought very *severe*.
Single

Single *Fathers* may err, especially wherein they are *singular*; but in this case the *Judgment* of the *Fathers* is as considerable as in any whatsoever; because herein they are *one and all agreed*. And to slight the concurrent Testimony of them all, and expose it as *false*, is the same in effect as to say, That the *Universal Church* for not less than five hundred Years, immediately from Christ's time, lay under an *Error*, which you are pleased to call *abominable*, and which (if you say true) must make them answerable in a great measure for all those *Disorders* and *Violences*, which were acted upon their causeless condemning of *Schismatics*. And thus to *save* your *Schismatics*, you do nothing less than send all the *Fathers* to *Hell*: For if that was a *Sin* in them, they never repented of it. Yet this is what you must persuade us to, before ever you can fairly bring us over to your Opinion.

(10.) I should now have done with what he hath said on this Topick, but that I cannot forbear taking notice of his comical and confident way of summing up his Evidence, and making his conclusive Inference: *Since* (saith he, p. 84.) *this damning Opinion is much taken from the Doctors of the Church of Rome, &c.* And yet had before confessed, that it was taken from *Fathers*, who were long before *Rome* was what it is now, or those *Doctors* were in being. *Since it hath no ground in Scripture, but is against it*: And yet he hath not alledg'd so much as one single Text of *Scripture* in this whole particular Head of Argument in his defence, that there might be the least shew of proof; though he could not but be sensible, that the *Fathers* did prove the contrary from *Scripture*, *Since it cuts off a great part of the Church of God, and oft-times some of the best of it*. How are they the Church of God, when cut off from it? But if
the

the *bottest Schismaticks* must pass for the *best of Christians*, I think *Religion* as well as the *World* is turn'd upside-down. But let us see what he will infer from all these *Since's*: Truly it is to give his Adversaries fair warning, That they *learn to be more mild in their Censures, and to take heed lest they, on some accounts, be not found Schismaticks themselves, and stand in need of the mildest Censure that may be justly given them.* The plain English of which is this: Look to your hits; for if we get the management of the Government into our hands, which we are in a fair way to, then the *English Moderation* shall be turn'd into *Scotch*; and the *Toleration of Episcopacy* shall be call'd *establishing Iniquity by a Law*; and we will have an *Act of Parliament* pass'd, that it shall be *Death* for any Man to *speak or write* in behalf of it. This will be doing business indeed, if better care be not taken: For the *Church and State* are next Neighbours; and when the one's House is on fire, the other's cannot be out of danger. And if you will not believe them upon former Experience, let them be try'd again, and they will thoroughly convince you, that they never want a Will to destroy both, when they have it in their Power.

C H A P. VII.

The Case of Communion with Schismatics ambiguously propounded by the Author, more clearly explain'd, §. 1. The Fathers defended against his Objections, 2. His Denial of the Assertion not true, 3. The Rules of the Primitive Church against Communion with Schismatics, 4. Concerning the Force of Ecclesiastical Canons, 5. The Disuse of ancient Discipline, whether by Papists or others, no good Plea in his Case, 6. The Mitigation of Punishment in the offending Clergy against him, 7. The Case of two Bishops in one City, 8. His Argument borrowed from Mr. Selden not good, 9. The Case of the Lapsi against him, 10. The Plea of the Orthodox Communion with Novatians at Constantinople answered, 11. And that of the Orthodox with Arians at Antioch, 12. His Inference from the Example of Satyrus trifling, 13. Other Instances already answered, and his Boast vain, 14. That Schismatical Communion endangers the Faith, 15. St. Cyprian wronged by, and the Episcopal Power explained against him, 16. The Design of the Author discovered and confuted, 17. His Citation from St. Cyprian full against him and his Party; and farther, the Power of the Civil Magistrate in Religious Affairs considered, 18.

(1.) **H**itherto our Author hath employed his utmost Skill to set off Schism with the finest Colours, and to make a *Beauty* of a *Bedlam*. Now comes on the other part of the Question, concerning Communion with Schismatics, which he lays down thus:

2dly, *It's said, we may not worship God at any time with such as are guilty of Schism.*

I can

I can scarce think a Man intends fairly, who leaves the known beaten Way, to tread unknown Paths; and will speak *ambiguously*, when he might with as much ease speak *plainly*. If by *worshipping of God with*, he means, *in the presence of such as are guilty of Schism*, it may alter the case: But that which we affirm is, That it is *not lawful to join in Communion with Schismatics*; nor can I imagine how any Man can think it lawful, who doth really judge them to be *Schismatics*. But here I am not to give my own Reasons, but to examine his. In this Sense he must be understood, if he speak to the purpose; but when he sets himself to defend his *Schismatical Communion*, he enters the Lists so doubtfully, and proceeds so shufflingly, and repeats what he had before said (and is already answered) over and over, and over again, and all wide from the business, that I profess I am ashamed to see so great a Man guilty of such trifling. It looks as if he either struggled against the *Dictates* of his own *Conscience*, or was given over to *strong Delusions*. He sets out very awkwardly, partly denying, partly affirming, but very obscurely. *There are some* (saith he, p. 85.) *that are guilty of such Schism, that we may not worship God with them*. Well then, by your own Confession, we are so far in the right. But he adds, *To say, we may not worship God with any that are guilty of Schism, is false*. However implicitly others may be led by you, you ought not to deal so with us, who you know expect proof. You talk of two sorts of *Schism*, but do not tell us what they are, nor set the due bounds betwixt both; and till you do that, your distinction will be useless, though it should be true. I wish you had told us what *Schismatical Communion* that is, which a Man may lawfully join in, tho' at the same time he acknowledgeth it to be *Schismatical*. For this
you

you must mean, *by worshipping God with Men in Schism*, if you speak to the present case: And then, I must tell you, that you had been obliged to prove it very well, and clearly, beyond any thing you have done. For he that will advance a *novel Notion* against what hath been received for *many Ages*, and heartily recommended by the *wisest and best of Men*, ought to give in *extraordinary Evidence*, or he will be thought guilty of *unpardonable Presumption*. And this we may more reasonably require of you, because there is just grounds to suspect, that you set up this only for an *occasional or temporary*, not a *durable Notion*. I have some where read of a *Cardinal*, who being a *Fisberman's Son*, to make a shew of great Humility and Condescension, caused a *Fishing-Net* to be daily spread over his Table at Meals; but as soon as he was chosen *Pope*, he commanded the *Net* to be taken away, giving this Reason for it, *That the Fish was caught*. You would now persuade us, that you are monstrously loving, and are ready to be one with all sorts of Men; but by what you have been, and have done, we have cause to suspect, that this is all design; and that when you have obtained your ends, you will be the first Men that will lay aside this Notion, and most forward to persecute any that maintain it. And therefore I wish, that you had distinguished so clearly, and proved so fully, that you might not have been able to have gone from it. But it may be thought unreasonable to require of a Man more than he is able to do; let us therefore try what it will amount to, which he hath done.

(2.) Several Texts of Scripture he sets down, which he saith *are alledg'd and mention'd by some of the Fathers*. By this it appears, that they thought they had *ground in Scripture* for this Opinion, though you confidently say there is none; and

and that they proved from *Scripture*, which I am sure is more than you have done. To those, many more might be added, but that is not my present business; but rather to examine the strength of his Objections against them. And in the first place he saith, *'Tis plain, these and other places which might be added, do not speak in particular of Schismatics, but of visible gross Sinners; of Fornicators, Idolaters, Drunkards,* (p. 87.) The contrary is plain: For though some of the Texts do mention those *gross Sinners*, yet others of them are plainly levell'd against *this gross Sin*: And there is not a Text there, but it either directly makes against *Schism*, or in the just consequence of it may be fairly urg'd against it: I refer to the Texts themselves. But he was aware this Answer would not do, and therefore of himself gives it up: But adds, *Those Texts can by consequence only reach such Schism, as is as damning as those gross Sins of Murther or Adultery.* But what if all *Schism*, properly so called, be as grievous a Sin as either *Murther or Adultery*? The *Scripture* doth not institute a parallel between *Schism*, and *Murther or Adultery*, but it condemns it as a *gross Sin*; and no less strictly commands to avoid the one as well as the other. But after all, the Question will be, Whether the *present Schism* be not as gross a Sin as *Murther or Adultery*? And if it be, then the Guilt will lie upon them who are the cause of it. I am sure it hath been the Mother of more Disorders and Confusions among us, of more Heart-burning, Hatred, Malice, Fury and Violence, than either or both of those Sins, though they are bad enough, and such as no good Man will plead their Cause, as you do the Cause of *Schism*. But this shall be try'd hereafter.

(3.) As for the blind Story of an unknown Minister, whose blind Zeal you deride, it is not worth notice.

notice. For another Man's rash Saying is not a Rule to us; and your self would think it very hard, if you were obliged to defend all the extravagant Sayings and bitter Censures, which have been uttered with Rancour enough by many of your Party. But this being trivial, you think to fright us with an opposite Practice of your Party: For say you, *The Dissenters, who believe if there be a Schism, that it lies at the door of their fierce Opposers, will, by the same Principle, think themselves bound to avoid them, (i. e. the Episcopal Church) not to worship God with them at all, or have any familiarity with them, (p. 88.)* And though you say, *we have not so learned Christ,* you ought to make an Exception; for many, whom you own of your Party, have *so learnt him, and so say, and so practise;* and even of late *so written and published in Print;* and I believe them to be much the more *sincere Men:* For I will say this for them, that they are right in the general Notion, though they are out in the application of it to their particular Case. They ought not to join in *Communion* with those, whom they really think to be *Schismatics:* For tho' they should think wrong, and be mistaken in their *Judgments,* yet it would be a Sin in them to act contrary to the Dictates of their *Conscience.* Their Error hath entangled them; and I know no way they have to disentangle themselves, but by such an impartial Search after Truth, as might rectifie their *Judgments,* and make them forsake their Evil Way. The Case of these Men is to be lamented; and it were a most Charitable and Christian Work to undeceive them.

(4.) Against our Opinion of not communicating with Schism, you next tell us, *That it is mainly built upon some Passages of the Fathers, if not upon Prejudices, or carnal Reasonings.* I have known
some

some of your *zealous Brethren*, who have called all Reasonings *Carnal*, which they could not answer. But I hope it is not the worse for us, that we have the *Fathers* on our side. In order to take off those, we have all the old stuff over again: And from what hath been already said, any one may be furnished with an answer to it; and therefore I shall be shorter upon this Head. You coldly tell us, that on our part it's said, *That to worship God sometimes with those that are guilty of Schism, is contrary to the Rules and Practice of the Primitive Church, which ought to be greatly observ'd.* And truly if there be the same Reasons against Schism now as then, if their Rules and Practice were settled upon eternal Foundations, such as are necessary not only for the Support, but to continue the very Being of the Church, then to destroy such Rules and Practice looks very like a design to destroy the Church. You cannot deny, but that the Scripture as much condemns Schism now as then; nor doth any thing bring in greater Troubles or Disorders, nor is a greater Scandal to our holy Religion; and to communicate in Schism, is not the way to put an end to it, but to increase and propagate it, till it eat up the Church; which things, if you had seriously considered, you might have thought it ill-became any one, who called himself a Christian, to plead the Cause of Schism. But since you have suffered your self to be retained on that side, you shall be heard what you can say for it.

(5.) It is with some Men a great piece of *Art*, (though no great Argument of *Sincerity* and *Conscience*) by all colourable means to disguise the matter in Controversie; and then to flourish with pretended Reasonings, little or nothing to the purpose; and so *weak Understandings* are either *lost* in a Wood, or *deluded* to be led by them: And of this

M

nature

nature is every thing here offer'd. And first he talks in general of the *Bishops and Churches making prudential Rules or Canons*, — for the better governing both of the Clergy and People, and for Union among themselves; but on several occasions, as the Circumstances of the Church chang'd, did change or go against them, (p. 89.) To this I answer, That the Canons of the Church were of two sorts; either such as were made concerning matters, in their own nature indifferent, for the preservation of Decency and Order; or such as were made in defence and corroboration of necessary matters. Concerning Canons relating to indifferent things, such is the temper of Persons, the diversity of Climates, and the variety of Usages and Customs, that all things could not fit all places, nor possibly the same thing the same places always; and therefore these were suited to the Condition of the Place and Convenience of the Flock; and Church-Governors might add to, alter, or disannul them, as they saw cause. But then they held in force, till otherwise ordered by a Church-Power, and could not be made void by every hair-brain'd Fellow. For to small purpose should they make any such Canons, if it was in the power of every Individual, whether he would obey them or not. So that if this were the case, you would get nothing by it. But then even the Church it self had not such power, as to Canons relating to necessary things. For tho' they might dispence with, or revoke the Canon, as to the *modus*, whereby it would lose all its force; (but then other due provision ought to be made;) yet they cannot disannul the thing, which the Canon was made to defend and secure. As for Instance: There is a Canon, that for the greater Solemnity, and better Notification of the thing, a Bishop shall be consecrated by three Bishops at the least. But before that Canon, Consecration by one

was

was

was good in it self, and will be so still, where *ibree* cannot be had: Necessity in such Cases brings a Dispensation along with it; nor can the Intention of the Makers of such Canon be supposed to be against it. But then they can neither so far destroy the Canon, or make any other, That any shall be a *Bishop* without *Ordination*, or that there shall be no such thing as *Ordination*; for then the *Church* in a short time would *fail*. But that we may come home to our particular Case of *Schism* and *Schismaticks*: Notorious Crimes being a disparagement to the Christian Religion, infectious to those within, and a scandal or stumbling-block to those without, the Church took care, for her own Honour and Satisfaction, their amendment, and the deterring of others, to keep such Offenders under severe Discipline and Penance; or if refractory, to cast them out: And scarce in any case was she more watchful and careful, than in the matter of *Schism*. But then it so happened; that by reason of the Number of Offenders, the Iniquity of the *Times*, or the various Circumstances of *Persons*, she sometimes thought fit to abate somewhat of her *Rigour*, and yield somewhat to *Necessity*; and there was a relaxation of *Penance*; and some *Schismaticks* were reconciled sooner, some later; some upon *easier*, and some upon *harder* terms. But still she made her *own terms*; a *Schismatick* might not come in at his pleasure, much less go in and out as he listed. She never reconciled any *Schismatick*, but that he first renounced his *Schism*, gave some *Testimony* of his *Repentance*, and sued for *Admittance*: And if the *Dissenters* would do thus, I doubt not but that they would find more *favour* than they *deserve*. What therefore you say concerning *Dispensation* with the *Rigour* of the *Canons*, or the *mitigation* of *Penance*, or the dropping some *Canons* at some times, is nothing to

the purpose : Because how willing soever they were to receive *returning Prodigals*, yet it was never known, that they ever own'd any *Schismatick*, continuing in *Schism*, to be of their *Body*, or would admit him to their *Communion*. This is what you ought to have proved, but do not ; but your own Instances rather prove the contrary : And therefore I think this might be a sufficient Answer, not only to what you say in General, but to all your particulars ; though more notice shall be taken of them than they deserve.

(6.) As to the first of your Particulars, I am far from denying the Truth of what you say ; but I wonder with what Confidence you could tell us so largely, and from so many gr. at Authors, with what severity the Ancients used the *Lapsi* and the *Schismatical* ; what *Hardships* and *Tryals* they imposed on them, by what *leisurely degrees* they admitted them, and how *many Tears* they exercised them before they would admit them to the *holy Eucharist*, unless they *earnestly desired* it in *articulo mortis* ; and even then, with a *Caution* to return to their *Penance*, in case they *recovered*. But it is still more wonderful, that you should think all this sufficiently answered, by saying, *That ancient Custom, ordered and practised by so many and great Persons, is not observed by the Papists or us*, (p. 91, 92.) For though I know you are beholden to the *Papists* for more than you are willing to own, yet I did not think you would have openly justified your *Practice* by their *Authority* : For if you intend it not for your *Justification*, to what purpose is it here *urged* ? Nay, so urged, as if their *Practice* were more *imitable* and *warrantable*, than that of the *whole Christian primitive Church* ? But though the Sense of *Christianity* is grown so low, and *Zeal* so cold, that these times will not bear the *ancient Discipline*, yet your *Papists* will do

do you no service in this matter: For if you are of that *Communion*, they will not suffer you to be of any *other*. Indeed I know not how far in their *wicked Politicks* they may proceed to dispense with, or give license to their *Missionaries*, to herd among *Dissenters*, that they may fill their Heads with *wild Notions*, and work *Confusion*: But whatever they do of this kind, they are not willing to own it; though I see not how your *Occasional Conformity* can condemn it. If the Church of *England* have not this Discipline, it is well known who hinders it; and it is her Grief and Complaint, that she wants it, as is to be seen in the *Communion* or Service for *Asb-Wednesday*. Nor did the ancient Church it self always rigorously observe those steps; but the *Bishop* had a power to *mitigate Penance*, as he saw cause; so order the *Nicene Fathers*, *Ἐξαινεῖ τὸς Ἐπισκόποι καὶ Φιλανθρωπότερον τι περὶ αὐτῶν βελτίδια*. (Can. 12.) i. e. *The Bishop may deal more gently with them*; that is, according as they give greater or less Evidence of their Repentance: But you are for no Repentance at all in the case, but for a promiscuous admitting all, which they utterly abhorr'd.

(7.) The Case of the Clergy furnisheth you with a second Instance, which is less to the purpose than the other: *It was* (say you) *a general and known Rule, that Bishops, Presbyters, or Deacons, that were guilty of Schism, or had lapsed into Idolatry, might not, when they repented, be restored to their former Dignity or Office; but be admitted only to Lay-Communion.* By the way, here take notice, that by his own Confession the same Punishment was assigned for *Schism* as for *Idolatry*: And if *Idolatry* be as great a Sin as either *Murder* or *Adultery* (which I think will scarce bear a dispute) then it will follow, that at least in the Judgment of the ancient Church, *Schism* was thought to be as

great a Sin as either *Murther* or *Adultery*. But to return to our business: Notwithstanding this Rule, you say they did not always thus; but *the Council of Nice continu'd the Novatian Clergy in their Offices, when they came to join with the Church*: And others you mention, who upon their return into the Bosom of the Church, were *continu'd in their former Places and Dignities*, (contrary to this Rule, p. 92, 93.) All this I think to be very justifiable; but is far from justifying you. For, according as Circumstances were, the Church had and hath a Power to increase, lessen, or quite change the *Punishment*; but she could not legitimate the *Crime*. She often condescended very far, and dealt mildly with *Offenders*, to recover them, because she would endure *Schism* upon no Terms whatsoever; what she remitted in this case, was to put an end to *Schism*, but never to allow it. And thus your Instance makes directly against you.

(8.) To make a noise with *Number*, where *Weight* is wanting; we are told, That it was judg'd an unsufferable thing to have two Bishops together in one City: But to prove there has been two at once, you instance in the Case of the Church of *Antioch*, and of the *Donatists* in *Africa*, (p. 93, 94.) How hard would you have been put to it, if there had been no *Irregularities*? It is a sign the Cause is desperate, which hath nothing wherewith to justify it self but *ill Precedents*. Let the best Laws and Rules be made that can be devised, yet such is the power of Corruption, and the unhappiness of this Life, that there will Disorders; but must those Disorders be turn'd into a Rule, and made a *standing Practice*? What shall become of all good and wholesome Laws at this rate? But these very Instances are so far from serving your Cause, that they make against it. As for your two Bishops at *Antioch*, it is not worth a dispute, whether you do
not

not mistake *Eusebius* for *Meletius*, Exceptions were taken on both sides against each other's *Ordination*; but though they were both *Orthodox*, and in that respect their *Communion* the same, yet the Church had no rest or peace, till the Care of the whole fell into one hand. And as for the *Orthodox* and *Donatists* in *Africa*, while they continued under those opposite *Denominations*, it is certain they allowed no *Communion* with each other; but when the matter came to be compounded, the *Orthodox* were willing to shew them all the favour they could, rather than be plagued with the *Schism*. In this Case they were willing to suffer two *Bishops* in one City for a while, provided there was but one *Communion*, and the whole without any *Copartner* to remain to the *Survivor*. All which shews how highly the Church disapproved and detested *Schism*; seeing she chose to bear with any inconvenience rather than that: For all this was done, that she might put an end to *Schism*, which she always accounted *intolerable*.

(9.) Our Author is so desirous to establish *Schism*, that rather than fail, for the sake of it, he would give up *Tithes*; and this he attempts upon Mr. *Selden's* Authority, who saith, That to argue from affirmative *Canons* only to *Practice*, is equal to proving a Custom from some Law of *Plato's* Common-wealth: For though there were many *Canons* and *Laws* for *Tithes*, yet (saith he) in no state of the *Western Church* whole *Tithes* are universally paid; but there are many Customs, not only against the *Modus*, but *de non decimando*, in *Germany*, *Spain*, *France*, *Italy*, &c. (p. 94, 95.) I shall readily grant, that the Rites of the Church are no where more abused, and converted from their right Use, than in the *Papacy*; which is the cause that their *Priests* are so zealous for many *superstitious Usages*, because otherwise they could not get a *Livelihood*; and

the Ravage and Sacrilege committed here, was chiefly done by Men of that Persuasion. But if affirmative Canons do not direct what ought to be Practice, I know not what they are good for, or of what force they can be said to be. I do not say they are always kept; but it is a mad Inference to say, that because they are sometimes broken, therefore they ought to be so always. At this rate you will make the *Laws of God* as insignificant as the *Laws of Plato's Common-wealth*. For whereas God pleads thus with his ungrateful People, *Will a Man rob God? Tet he hath robbed me; But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? In Tithes and Offerings*, (Mal. 3. 8.) If you or Mr. Selden had been then living to instruct them, it had been but pleading *prescription* against him, and alledging you had a Custom *de non decimando*; and then where had been the Robbery? But to make this as serviceable to Schism as may be, you add: *So tho' many Canons have been against Communicating with Persons guilty of Schism, yet 'tis like they have not been generally observed*. But whether they were observed or not, do not the Canons inform us of the Sense and Judgment of the Church? And if some Men had not observed them, for which in this particular you have only a *groundless guess*, was not that their fault? Or if they were sometimes broken, doth it thence follow, that they must never be kept? If a Law be violated, instead of correcting and amending the fault, must we lay aside the Law? If this Reasoning be good, no Law can stand before you, nor indeed oblige any Man longer than he pleaseth.

(10.) If a Man had a mind to betray his Cause, and argue against himself, he could hardly have made choice of fitter Instances. For what if *divers Presbyters and holy People communicated with the Lapsed, and gave them the Eucharist, before they*
bad

had fulfill'd the due time of Penance, or had *Imposition of Hands* by the Bishop? (p. 95, 96.) Doth this make any thing for the propagation and countenancing of *Schism*? It is true, that the unwearied importunity of the *Lapsed* did sometimes so prevail upon the Compassion of the *Confessors*, that they did unseasonably and irregularly *dare pacem* to the *Lapsi*, which was thought to qualify them for the *Eucharist*; of which St. Cyprian very justly complains. But to what end was this? It was to take them into the Church, not to keep them out: It was to prevent *impatient Men* from taking desperate Courses, and keep up one *Communion*. They would never have kept such a bustle and stir to be reconciled to the Church, and never be at quiet till they obtained it, if they had had but half so good an opinion of *Schism* as our Author, and thought they might have been safe in it; but this they did, because they thought there was no safety in *Schism*.

(11.) Hitherto we have not had one Instance which hath not made against *Schism*; and many great Persons he hath mentioned, which have declared against *Schism*, all whom he answers with accusing them as guilty of a fault; as if his bare Word were of more authority than all the Sayings and Reasonings of the *Fathers*: But if any thing in Antiquity look in the least towards his Cause, he hath stumbled upon it now: *The Orthodox* (saith he, p. 96.) held *Communion* with the *Novatians* in the Persecution under Constantius, &c. But this Twig will not save you: For here several things ought to be well considered. 1st, That all the Oratories, or places of Prayer, were taken away from the *Orthodox*, (vid. Soz. lib. 4. cap. 20.) And seeing both Parties were found in the Faith, and the main difference between them being concerning the *Reconciliation of Penitents*, which did not affect

affect their *Prayers*, it might be a strong Temptation, when they could with safety no where else worship God publickly. 2dly, The *Novatians* having three Churches allowed them, they were in possession at least of the *pretended Authority*; and so what was done, was done by their (i. e. a *Schismatical*) *Authority*; and then this is only to urge the *Authority* of *Schismatics*, for a *Schismatical Communion*. 3dly, It was at best but a *partial Communion*: For the *Novatians* refused to admit the *Orthodox* to the *holy Eucharist*, without which *Communion* is not compleat. 4thly, This was done only by *some Persons* in *one single City*, when the contrary Practice at the same time held all over the *Christian World*, and consequently was *condemn'd* by them. And if the irregular Practice of a *few Persons*, for *some small time*, in *one only place*, may be urged against both the *Laws* and *Practice* of the *whole Church*, then and at all times before, it will be safer to *break Laws* than to *keep* them: For at this rate, all *Laws* and honest *Practice* must give place to *ill Examples*: And thus the greatest Wickedness may be justified. For I do not think that any so villainous an Act can be committed, for which a Precedent may not be found; and yet this is the *Plea* made for *Schism*.

(12.) The next Instance is worse than this, if the Consequence he draws thence be of any force. For whereas he tells us, That the *Orthodox* sometimes held *Communion* with the *Arians*, who are worse than *Schismatics*, (p. 97.) The Consequence will be, in his way of Arguing, that we may communicate with the worst of *Hereticks*, as well as *Schismatics*. And thus not only *Ecclesiastical Government*, but the *Christian Faith* it self shall be sent away packing in favour of *Socinians* and their *Associates*: And what then shall become of the *Church* it self? But that he might not seem to be without some

some colour for what he had said, he tells us, That when Meletius was banished from Antioch, and Euzoius the Arian put in his place, the Orthodox, who from the expulsion of Eustathius their Bishop, had for thirty Years born the Arians, in hope of better times, began to have Assemblies separated from them: And for this he cites Theodoret's Hist. l. 7. whose History contains only five Books. But perhaps it may be an Error in the Press, for lib. 2. cap. 31. where you may find a larger account of this maimed Relation. The truth is, The Arians, though none more barbarously Cruel, when in power, yet in their beginning, and while at an under, were the most insinuating, shuffling sort of Moderation-men that ever the Church was plagu'd with, unless these times have outdone them: They would be troublesome, but when press'd hard, they would seemingly comply; yet so as to keep a reserve: That you knew not where to have them, nor what to make of them. And thus long the Church, which is always tender, in hope of their amendment, forbore them. But when they discovered their Impiety, and (as the Historian hath it) found them to be *ἄνθρωποι ἀνίσχυροι ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀνίσχυροι ἐναντίον τοῦ λαοῦ*, At open War against the Truth, as well as they had been before secret underminers of it; then they thought there was no safety for their Souls in such Communion, but applied to their case that of the Angel to Lot in Sodom, *ὤψον (ὦψ: ἦ Γεωργίου ψυχῶν)*, which we render not so emphatically, *Escape for thy Life*, (Gen. 19. 17.) and also that of our Saviour, *If thy right Eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee*, (Mat. 5. 29.) Which shews, that though done with some grief, because they had been their Fellow-Christians, and Members of the same Body; yet then they thought themselves under a necessity, for the safety of their own Souls, utterly

utterly to abandon them, and no more to communicate with them: And what more could they do? For as to us, *de non existentibus & non apparentibus eadem est ratio*; we cannot judge of a thing but as it appears; and as soon as a certain discovery was made, they took this course. So that if this Instance prove any thing, it is so far from encouraging Schism, that it proves we ought by no means to communicate with *known Hereticks and Schismaticks*.

(13.) Had I not seen it, I should never have thought, that it would have been made an Argument for *Schism*, that *St. Ambrose in his Funeral Oration for his Brother Satyrus, among other things, praises him, that when he was in Africk, where there was a Church of the Luciferians, he would not communicate with them*, (p. 97.) For the commendation of a Man, for not communicating with *Schismaticks*, seems to be a very odd Justification of *Schism*. But see what a Theological Chymist can do, even extract moisture out of a Flint. For this he tells us was a sign that many communicated with them, at least occasionally, else it had not been a matter of such commendation as Ambrose makes it. And it might as well be a sign, that none did communicate with them, but those of their own Persuasion: For you can bring no Instance to prove your Sign. The Case of the *Luciferians* and our *Dissenters* is very different, and there might be great reason for them to court the Communion of *Satyrus*; and from thence was his Commendation the greater, that he refused it. But if any other did communicate with them, it was their crime; or else *Satyrus* and *St. Ambrose* were both out in this very case. But as for your communicating occasionally, in the sense it is taken in our days, it was so universally detested by the *Ancients*, that the very *Schismaticks* of those times would not endure it.

(14.) The

(14.) The Instances of *Paulinus*, *St. Chrysostom*, &c. have been already considered; and when the most is made of them that can be, they are so very wide from the case of our *Dissenters*, that they can do them no service; and therefore it is needless to pursue them farther. And for the same reason I am not much concerned, whether *Baronius* or *Hody* were in the right in the matter of *Ignatius* and *Plotinus*. For the Question was, Which was their *true Bishop*; and upon that score, which was the *right Communion*? And if you and *Mr. Hody* will say, that their Followers communicated together, which *Baronius* denies; you ought to shew us, how in any Propriety of Speech in this case they could be said to be *Followers* of *either*, when they refused the *Communion* of *neither*. If you say, that they communicated together, when the breach was made up, it is nothing to the purpose. After this long detail, you would make us believe, that you have still a farther Stock in store: *We have* (say you, p. 98.) *some Instances of divers, and among them of the Bishops of Rome, who have held Communion with those that were guilty of Schism*: But this Reserve you keep to your self; and till you set down the Persons and Facts, it may pass for a Vapour, and it cannot be expected we should return any answer to it. In the mean time, I must tell you, that it is no very laudable Employment to ransack the *History* of so many *Ages*, to cull out the *faults* of Men, or to make those *faults*, which were *none*. But it is still worse to propose them for *Imitation*, that the *Miscarriages* of Men may become the *standing Rule* of *Practice*, and subvert all *Law* and *Order*: And this is plainly the design of your Book. We are like to have blessed Times, when Men acquire the Title of the *only Saints*, by promoting the *utmost Confusions*.

(15.) His tedious Train of forc'd Instances being

ing brought to an end, by a seeming Inference he endeavours to impose this upon us: That *many things that were generally practised have been disused and chang'd, and so may this,* (p. 98.) If you speak to the purpose, your meaning must be this: That because some things have been disused and changed, therefore *non-communication with Schismatics* may be changed into the quite contrary, *viz. into Communion with Schismatics*; which is so dangerous and horrid a Consequence, as strikes at the root of Religion. It is true, things of an *indifferent* nature have and may be changed at the discretion of Church-Governors: But *Communion with Schismatics* is not a thing of that nature; and if the Reasons for *not communicating with Schismatics* be perpetual, and the *abstaining from such Communion* be necessary, for the preservation not only of the Government, but the Faith of Christ's Church; then, though some other things have or may be changed, yet this may not. And truly for my part, I cannot see how the Faith can be secured, if *Communion with Schismatics* be allowed. For there are few *Schismatics*, but that they are either *Hereticks* in the beginning, or quickly become so; and therefore to allow a promiscuous *Communion* with them, is the ready way to corrupt the Faith, and in time to lose it. And I doubt not, but that if any had maintained the lawfulness of *Communion with Schismatics*, as a *Doctrinal Truth* in the primitive Times, those holy Fathers would have condemn'd it as *rank Heresie*, and delivered the Person unto *Satan*, that they might learn not to blaspheme. This Opinion and Practice seems in a great measure to be derived from the ancient *Gnosticks*, who never stuck at any *Compliance* to avoid *Persecution*; and if it must be *orthodox* now, which was not so then, we may bid defiance to the Exhortation of St. Jude, which

is earnestly to contend for the Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints.

(16.) It is (to say no worse) a bold undertaking to close this Head of Argument, by making St. Cyprian of your Party: No Man hath more freely, nor more sharply inveighed against *Schism* than he; and hitherto there is no Man against whom you had more grievous Complaints; that all on a sudden he should be brought over, and become your Friend, is somewhat strange. For he had censured *Schism* as a Sin, as bad or worse than *Murder* or *Adultery*; and I am sure St. Cyprian could neither make *Murder* or *Adultery* lawful, and consequently upon his Principles could not make *Schism* lawful. It must be some strange inconsistency, which must destroy this, which he hath so plainly declared against. But when I come to examine those Passages of his, which you say may a little enlarge our Minds, and be useful to us; I find nothing but some Sayings concerning the Power and Practice of Bishops, and what Authority by Christ and his Apostles was committed to them; the sum of all which is included in this Citation of yours: So long as no Decree of the Church intervenes, every Bishop doth all things, as to the Government of the People committed to him, according to his own Judgment, (p. 100.) Some perhaps by mistake may from hence think, you are become *Episcopal*, but it is sham. We are willing to acknowledge the Bishop's Power; and it would be more for your own good, and the peace of the Church, if you would do so too: Be their true Power what it will, no Bishop can make that to be no Sin, which is a Sin. Did any of those Bishops, to whom you refer, say, that *Schism* was no Sin, or that it was lawful to communicate with *Schismatics*? Nay, have they not expressly and fully declared to the contrary? And then, what is it

to your Cause, what their *Power* was otherwise ? If you will so acknowledge their *Power*, as to submit to their *determination*, they have given the Cause against you. These stiff Primitive Bishops will never do you any service ; you had done more advisedly to let them alone, and come down to your own Days, and gone in search of certain Persons, called *Bishops*, who are Enemies of *Episcopacy* : These might have merited your *good word*, though you would not come under their *authority*. But the Nature of things continue the same ; tho' Men may endeavour to put new Faces upon them. If the *Husbandman* sleep, while the *Enemy* sows Tares ; or the *Shepherd* abandons his *Sheep* to the *Wolf* ; or by a worse Metamorphosis than that of the *German Were-wolf*, turns *Wolf himself* ; will this either make the *Tares* good *Wheat*, or the *Wolf* a true *Pastor* ? Do you allow the *Bishops* their *due Power*, and we are ready to allow all Men their *just Liberty* ; but you must search for new Precedents, if you continue still in the same Mind ; for the *great Liberties* you talk of in *Cyprian's Age*, are far from justifying the *Licentiousness* of these times.

(17.) It ought not to be concealed, that this Author hath somewhat a farther and deeper reach, which he discovers obscurely. For from the *Power* of the *primitive Bishops* he obliquely infers an *equal Power* in the *Dissenters* ; though even that would not justify them in *Schism*, if it were *true* ; and yet nothing is more *false*. Two things he denies, in order to introduce this : *There were* (saith he) *then no Civil Laws for ordering the Church*. Doubtless he thought this would pass for a wonderful Discovery : The then *Civil Laws* were for the *Destruction* of the *Church*, not for the *Well-ordering* it. For the *Empire* was then *Heathen*. But if *Heathen Emperors and Kings* made *Laws* to extirpate the

the *Christian Religion*, might not *Christian Emperors* and *Kings* make *Laws* for its *preservation*? When the *Empire* became *Christian*, this was done: And if our Author please to look into the *Theodosian* and *Justinian Codes*, he may there find enough of this kind, if not too many. Next, saith he, There was no *Impositions of Forms or Ceremonies*, no *Subscriptions* enjoyn'd, or *Penalties annex'd*. And this is as false as the other was true. For what shall we say to all their *Liturgies*? When they sung *Hymns*, did they sing *ex tempore* Verses? What means their standing at *Prayers* from *Easter* to *Whitsuntide*? or the *Cross* in *Baptism*, and the *Baptismal Vow*, the same in effect which our Church useth at this day? All these were either *Forms or Ceremonies*; and more might be added. And then for *Subscriptions*, what do you think of the *Councils*? When *Matters* were determined by them, did they leave it at liberty, whether those *Determinations* should be *subscribed* to or not? Look again, and you will find, that *Subscriptions* were then *rigorously required*. And as for *Penalties*, can you find none in the *Canons*? If you cannot, you are one of those who cannot see *Wood* for *Trees*. And if the *Multitude* be sometimes unruly, and will hardly be prevail'd on to submit to what they ought to do, is it not an excellent *Mob-argument* thence to infer, that *the Government lay much in the People*? But now comes the *Secret*, the *Diana* of the *Ephesians*; *The Bishops had but one Congregation for their Diocess*. He that dares assert this, may say any thing, till no wise or honest Man will believe him. But however, if his *Bishop's Diocess* be so small, he makes him some amends by arming him with *Power*: For (saith he) *every Bishop dispos'd of things in his own Church*; and (which surely, according to our Author's Scheme, must be by way of *Condescension* and *Favour*, when *Fanaticks* were better

N

humour'd

humour'd than they are in our days) yet kept up a loving Communion with each other: And this (if you can believe it) was the Practice of Cyprian's Age, (p. 101.) This is very pretty: But to what end is all this Contrivance? I am very well satisfied, that the Brethren will not stick at a Lye; but then I must say this for them, that they make some use of it, and have some design in it. Perhaps he might not think it convenient to lay himself too open; but you may fairly guess at the design by the Inference he makes. For to support that Inference, you must necessarily suppose, That every pretended Minister among the Dissenters, who has a Congregation, is as much a Bishop as St. Cyprian, yea just such another: And then you must allow Mr. Tallents, Mr. Do-little, Mr. Daniel Burgess, and the rest of them, to be as good, if not better Bishops, than any Diocesans whatsoever. If you please to grant this, then there is some colour for what he infers, That the Practice of Cyprian's Age, which was brought against the Dissenters, seems to make for them, to be much like what they use, and that according to it they may go in their own way, &c. The Examination of this Particular will fall under what I design for the last Chapter, but it must not be altogether pass'd by here. The activity and boldness of the Dissenters being consider'd, it is no wonder, that so many weak People are deceived; nay truly, I think the case of many Men, otherwise of good Parts and Judgment, is to be lamented, who are led away for want of ability or opportunity to look into the ancient state of the Church: But for a Man, who must necessarily have made such a search into Antiquity, as could qualify him to write what he calls his *short History*, to say this; I cannot forbear to declare my Thoughts, that he is either given up to strong Delusions to believe a Lye, or is resolved to gratifie

gratifie his *Faction* with the prostitution of his *Conscience*, and in defence of *Schism* to outface plain *Truth*. For is it possible, that he could really think that St. *Cyprian* was no more than a *Parish Priest*, or the *Minister* of a single *Congregation*? He was Bishop of *Carthage*, the greatest City in *Africa*, and about that time reputed the *Third City* of the *Roman Empire*: The Jurisdiction of it extended over a vast Tract of Land, as far as the *Ara Philenorum*, in which were many *Cities*, besides *Villages*; and the extent of *Diocesses* originally following the *Civil Division*, it is likely his Jurisdiction extended as far as the Jurisdiction of the City: But then consider him as an *Archbishop*, and his Care was still greater, and his Authority went farther. For this account he gives himself: *Latius fusa est Provincia nostra, habet enim Numidiam, & Mauritanias duas sibi coherentes, (Ep. 45. Cornelio Ed. Pam.) i. e. My Province is very large, for it bath Numidia, and both the Mauritania's joyn'd to it.* If he had told us, that *England, Scotland* and *Ireland*, made up the *Congregation* of one *Parson* or *Minister*, it would have done no hurt; for People perhaps might have laugh'd at him, but no body would have believ'd him; and yet with as much Reason and Truth might he have said this, as to tell us, that St. *Cyprian* was the *Minister* only of a single *Congregation*: But I shall prosecute this here no farther. And indeed I did hope Dr. *Maurice's* Answer to *Clarkson* had silenced this dispute: But I find some Men will never be answered.

(18.) I was amazed to see him cite St. *Cyprian* accusing *Novatian* of setting up a *Humane* or *Worldly Church*; and farther illustrating it from *Rigaltius*, and the *Oxford Notes*: The whole were worth reciting, did I not avoid tediousness. For it falls heavy on the whole Body of the *Dissenters*, who in

this have outdone *Novatian*, and by usurping a Power they have not, *make the Church a Humane Thing, and administer not Sacraments, but Sacrileges*; to prevent which the Bishop had justly blamed those *Politicians, who draw all things to the Civil Magistrate, and think it belongs to him to constitute or alter the Government of the Church as he pleaseth*. For at this rate, the *Institution of Christ* must give way to the *Disposition of the Civil Government*, whenever it shall, for any wicked or worldly ends, think fit; and so may be either continued, changed, or rooted out at pleasure. And if this Power be in the *Civil Magistrate*, the *Conscience of the Subject* must follow it, if there be any *Conscience in Religion*: And thus it may be brought to pass, that according to this Reasoning, a Man may think himself bound in Conscience to cast off the *Christian Religion*. His answer to this is, after his usual shuffling way, thus: *Those Politicians (if there be any) who think they may alter such Bishops, or Government of the Church, as Christ our Lord and Lawgiver hath instituted and appointed, are justly and greatly to be censur'd and condemn'd*, (p. 103.) Why should you make it a question, *Whether there be any*? When you know it is done in *Scotland*, and you your self are now paving the way, that it may be done here: For the mystery of your Answer lies in the Phrase *such Bishops*; and unless we know what you mean by them, we shall take our aim amiss. For by this we are to understand, that there are *some Bishops*, which his *Politicians* may alter; but there are *such Bishops*, which they may not. Now it is the utter ruin of his Cause to make any other *Bishops unalterable*, than his *new-fashion'd Congregational Bishops*. And then let every *Jack Presbyter* be a *Bishop*, and a *Throne* set up in every *Parish*, and then the *Government* shall be *jure divino*, and
unalterable:

unalterable : But as for those *Bishops*, who follow the *Primitive Pattern*, and have received their *Authority* by a *Succession* from the *Apostles Times*, if it be not convenient at present to call them *Babylonish* and *Antichristian*, yet they are *alterable* at his *Politician's* Pleasure; and no doubt must be *altered*, when this *pert, insolent, unalterable Bishop* shall require it. Open your Eyes now, Gentlemen, and tell me, whether the Design of this mighty Cry of *Moderation* be not to cover them, while they undermine and extirpate *Episcopacy*: And though they pretend at present, that they can *occasionally communicate* with it, yet they intend not long to have any *occasion* for it. As for what he saith, That *Princes and Parliaments may remove or alter such things as are only of a prudential and humane Constitution*, I am little concerned: For I shall never quarrel with my Superiors about things indifferent. But seeing a Man will not build a *House* without the advice of a *Carpenter*, nor try a *Suit* without the advice of a *Counsellor*, I think it very reasonable in *Church Affairs* to take in the concurrence of *Churchmen*. And if no Man is to be despised in his proper Employment, certainly much less those, who have the Conduct and Cure of our Souls: The *Reputation of Religion* it self must run low, when the *Ministers* of it are *contemptible*.

C H A P. VIII.

That they ought better to explain their Meaning concerning Occasional Conformity, §. 1. His Explanation leaves it more in the dark, 2. Hypocritical Occasional Conformity both condemned and maintained by them, 3. He doth not discharge Occasional Conformity from Hypocrisie, much less prove it not sinful otherways. Their Actions no Rule to us, 4, 5. Want of other Opportunity, or Eloquence of the Preacher, no warrant to join in a Schismatical Communion, 6. The Objections made stand firm and good against him, 7, 8. Mr. Baxter's Example considered, 9. That the Reason he urgeth, and Examples he brings, do not reach or affect the Case, 10. His Answer to the Objection weak, but his Discovery plain, 11. None of the best Council given, but refused for worse; which yet will not support Occasional Conformity, 12. His Reasons to induce others to it frivolous, 13, 14. His Examples as bad, 15, 16. His idle Pretences and Projects for strengthening the Church, 17, 18. And ends in the old sham cry of Popery, 19.

(1.) **I** Come now to his last effort, which he lays down thus:

To worship God sometimes with those, with whom we do not always, is oft a Duty, and a special means to prevent, remove, or greatly to lessen the Sin of Schism, and to promote that which is so desirable, Catholick Communion, (p. 104.)

This, you say, seems to shine in its own light. And so doth a House set on fire, when it hastens full speed to its utter ruin: God preserve us from such shining Lights. This (you say) hath been usually call'd Occasional Conformity. But before I can proceed,

proceed, I must crave leave to be a little better inform'd about it. You do not seem to allow a Man to be *wholly* an *Occasional Conformist*, and to ramble continually from one Communion to another, without being fix'd to any. I must therefore suppose, that you intend he shall be a *stated Conformist*, as to some one *certain Communion*, though you allow him *occasionally* to conform to many others. Now though this may be evident in the Practice of some, yet it may be so doubtful in others, that I may not be able to discern (if I must judge by his Actions) when he acts as an *Occasional*, and when as a *Stated Conformist*; and consequently cannot tell what to make of the Man. I desire therefore to know, how much Conformity is required to make him a *Stated Conformist*, and how much may be allowed that he shall pass for no more than an *Occasional Conformist*? For this Allowance being made, different Communions are so many, that variety may tempt him to visit the *several* Communions, that he may neglect his *approved* Communion; and therefore if you set him not his bounds, beyond which he ought not to pass, your distinction may encourage *Looseness*, but will not enable us to make a Judgment of some Men, whose they are, or whether they belong to any. But if you will not allow me to judge by their Practice, but think it sufficient, that a Man declares to what Communion he is a *stated Conformist*, still the same difficulty recurs: For if in his Actings he be as much or more an *Occasional Conformist* as a *Stated*, you oblige me to believe his *Word*, contrary to his *Actions*: And what shall I think of that Man, who declares, that he approves one thing, and *doth* another? And thus your celebrated Distinction, in respect of many Men, is of no use, unless for *Licentiousness* and *Confusion*.

(2.) But you like not the word *Occasional*, and say, it is not proper, for it doth not fitly express what is intended, and gives a pretence to some to speak against it. And yet the distinction is your own (I mean of your Party) and fitted to your purpose, the best you could; and if it be not proper, you ought to give us some other; and explain it in such a term, that would give no pretence to speak against it: But this you will not do, lest we should know your Meaning. And it was discreetly done; for if you had offered at any other term, I am confident it would have given farther pretence to speak against it: But since you will not clearly explain your self, we must follow you in the way you are pleased to go. You say, *By the word Occasional, we are to understand the worshipping God sometimes with some, tho' we usually worship God with others.* But this is such an Explanation, as makes us more at a loss to know your Meaning than we were before. For Men may worship God sometimes with some, though they usually worship God with others, and yet not be in the least guilty of your sort of *Occasional Conformity*. For suppose that a *Churchman*, who lives in *London*, travels to *Chester*, and goes to Church there; it is true, the Communion is *occasional* as to the place, but not as to the thing, or the Communion it self: For the Communion there is the same, the Worship the same, the Authority the same, and all the Parties agreed, and in the same Communion, as far as is possible for Men in distant places to be. And therefore by your worshipping of God sometimes with some, tho' you usually worship God with others, must be understood your occasionally worshipping God with some, tho' you usually worship God with others, who are of an opposite Communion to them: And then, whether they do it hypocritically, or through looseness of Principle, still the same

same Objection returns. For as they may use their *Occasional Conformity*, no Man living may be able to know what to make of them.

(3.) This *Occasional Conformity*, when it is an *Hypocritical Practice*, when for some by-end, to avoid trouble, or get some advance by Places of Credit, Trust, or Profit, or the like, you acknowledge to be a *horrible Sin*. But do you not make your Advantage of this *Hypocrisie* and *horrible Sin*? Is not the *Action* presently *sanctified*, if the *Person* be on your side? What is it you roar and rail for? What is it you write and scribble for, and set up *Observers* and *Reviewers*, to bespatter all Men that will not close with you? For what is it that you slice Estates into Morsels to *multiply Votes*, and *blacken Tackers*, and all that speak or write in behalf of the *Bill*? For what is it that you magnifie and animate one Party in the House of *Lords* against the other, and against the House of *Commons*? Search to the bottom, and lay the Sore open, and it will appear, that all this bustle and stir is to *encourage* and *support* that *Hypocrisie* which you pretend to *condemn*. For there is none of you would spend his *Breath*, much less his *Money*, in defence of *Occasional Conformity*, if it were not for what he or his Party have got, and hope farther to get by it. Till you can be content to part with the advantagious use that may be made of this *Hypocrisie*, we cannot but think you a *Friend* to it. In the mean time, I do not say this Practice is always *hypocritical*; for it may proceed from *Lightness*, *Wantonness*, *Curiosity*, or *Looseness of Principle*; none of which I take to be very commendable: And yet, for any thing we know, there may be *Hypocrisie* in it all along. For suppose a Man to have practised *Occasional Conformity* for some time before he hath a Place, or perhaps hath no Place; yet who can tell what he hath in his

his Eye? And may he not do this to avoid the Scandal of beginning then, when he enters upon a Place, and so be the deeper *Hypocrite*? Set the best Face on it you can, and still it will be liable to *Suspicion* and *Doubtful*, and therefore not well consistent with *Christian Sincerity*.

(4.) I have before granted, and I think all Men will grant it, that Men may be so debauched in their Principles, as to think many things lawful, which are not. I suppose you are not ignorant of the Story of the *Robber*, who always before he took Horse solemnly went to Prayers, earnestly begging of God to prosper him in the Works of his Calling; i. e. *Robbing on the High-way*. And I fear, that the working of Confusions in Church and State may prove in its effects a far more mischievous Sin, than Robbing on the High-way. If therefore you had been able to discharge this Practice from *Hypocrisie*, it would concern you to prove, that it is not *sinful* in other respects. But whether your *Dissenters* in this be *Hypocrites* or not, the Argument you make use of to clear them from *Hypocrisie* is very insufficient. For can you think it will do their business to all us, *Whether we know their Hearts?* (p. 105.) They may be *Hypocrites*, though we do not know their Hearts; and Men may be discover'd to be *Hypocrites*, though there be no Window in their Breasts to look into their Hearts. The Tree may be known by its Fruits. Our Saviour called the *Scribes and Pharisees Hypocrites*; and for justifying his Censure, he did not plead his Prerogative of *knowing Men's Hearts*, but proved it from their Actions. If you can prove, that a Man cannot be known to be a *Hypocrite*, unless we can see into his Heart, you will offer a strong Temptation for all Men to turn *Hypocrites*; because, if *Hypocrisie* be not otherwise discoverable, the *Hypocrite*, at least as to this World,

World, will be the *safest* of all Men living. To less purpose still is what follows, where he tells us of their People, their Ministers, their Meetings, and what they have done, now do, or think lawful: For this is the matter in Controversie. Indeed if we were bound to think every thing lawful which you do or say, the Dispute were at an end: But when a thing is under debate, to tell me what they do or think, and thence infer the lawfulness of it, is a very presumptuous odd sort of Reasoning; for it is in effect to tell me, that I must take his word for every thing, even while I am disputing it with him. But since I am not so easie and credulous, I must desire him henceforward not to tell me *what* they do, but *why* they do it. I know I ought to follow my Lord and Saviour *Christ Jesus*; and even St. Paul himself will not desire me to be a *follower of him* farther than he was of *Christ*, (1 Cor. 11. 1.) And if when a Matter is in question, my Adversary, instead of giving me *Reasons*, shall propose to me his own *Example*, it may discover the *fond* and *vast Opinion* he hath of himself; but I must beg his Pardon, if I cannot take it for an *Argument*: And indeed, if I were to look out for *Precedents* for my *Practice*, I think, of all Men living, I should not seek for them among *Schismatics*.

(5.) But not content with this, our Author still makes a farther advance, and tells us, That *we worship God sometimes with those, with whom we do not constantly, is not only lawful, but oft a duty, and an excellent one*, (p. 107.) O rare! What a Blessing it is to be stock'd with *Schismatics*? For otherwise we should not be able to do our Duty towards God. But I hope you will prove this with better *Reasons*, than proposing your own or your Brethren's *Example*: For though this may convince me, that you sometimes do as you say, yet
it

it will never prevail with me to follow either you or a multitude to do evil. If it could be made appear, that a set of Men were so *infallible* and *impeccable*, that they could not do amiss; it were sufficient to warrant their Practice, and recommend it to others, to tell us what it is: But when they dare not pretend to *Infallibility*, and their Practice is arraign'd as *unlawful*, to think to justify it by telling us what they do, is the most ridiculous thing in the World. Yet this is the course he takes for several Pages together. And if it were as lawful for me as for him to cite a *Papist*, I could tell him of one who would spoil all he hath said in few words: It is the Answer of *Gilbert Foliot* Bishop of *London*, to *Thomas Becket* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, who endeavouring to run him down with telling him, that *Thus and Thus it was done at Rome*; received this smart Reply from him: *Vivimus præceptis, non exemplis; nec quod Romæ factum fuerit, sed quod fieri debuit, attendendum est; i. e. We ought to govern our Lives by Precepts, not Examples; nor are we to mind what is done at Rome, but what ought to be done.* But of all the Men I ever had to do with, I never met with this Author's fellow for an incomparable way of proving a thing. For not content to propose his own and others Examples, to justify what we say is unlawful, which no Man in his Wits will agree to, unless he thought they could do nothing amiss; he farther proceeds to give us contradictory Examples to prove the same thing. For (p. 108.) he tells us, That generally the *Presbyterians*, and some other *Dissenters* also, judge it lawful, and sometimes a duty, for them to do so, and practise accordingly: And thence you must conclude *Occasional Conformity* to be not only lawful, but a duty. But (p. 109.) he tells you, That the *Independents* generally think they may not

worship

worship God with the Conformists at any time. And this also is brought to prove *Occasional Conformity*, not only *lawful*, but a *duty*. But that you may see that he is afraid of no Contradictions, and can easily reconcile them, he farther tells you (p.110.) That some *Presbyterians* think they are bound always to do that in the *Worship of God* which is best; and there cannot be two Bests: Therefore since they judge their own way to be best, they ought always to go in it, and never to join with any others, neither with the Church by Law established, or any others. Some weak Persons may think, that if this proves any thing, it is so far from proving *Occasional Conformity* a *duty*, that it proves it *unlawful*. But you shall see how he will presently convince you of your mistake: For saith he, The *Presbyterians* think themselves bound to join sometimes with the *Conformists*, though they judge their own way better than theirs; and that in doing so sometimes, they do that which is best. But at this rate, will there not be two Bests, and one of them better than best? But it matters not for that, so long as, whether they approve or condemn *Occasional Conformity*, it makes it not only *lawful* but a *duty*: Who can stand against such Reasoning? What doth he think of other Men? Doth he look on them all as Fools, that will swallow any thing? Or what doth he think of himself? Doth he imagine himself arriv'd to that Authority and Perfection, that his *ipse dixit* must pass with all Men? But let him think what he will of himself, I am afraid that others will think, that a Man, who argues at this rate, either *dozes* or is *craz'd*. I must therefore desire him to apply himself to that *stubborn sort* of his *dissenting Brethren*, and try first, whether he can persuade them to allow *Occasional Conformity* to be *lawful*, because they judge it *unlawful*, before he impose it upon us:

us : For otherwise we are never like to have any Peace upon these Terms, as bad as they are.

(6.) Having shewed the Absurdity of this way of Arguing, I need not trouble my self with every little trifling matter, wherewith he labours in vain to support it; only I shall take notice of one thing, because I find it too taking with many Persons: *Many* (saith he) *oft have not opportunity to join with those of their own way, and therefore go to the publick.* It seems then, that if there were none of their own way, the Publick would be lawful enough *always*: What pity is it they ever came among us! But, Sir, you had best have a care how you argue after this fashion. And I must desire you to consider, whether if you were in a *Papish Country* this would not lead you to *Mass*? For if the *want* of your own way be the *reason* of your so doing, it is as good a reason for the one as the other. You ought therefore first to consider the Lawfulness of what you do: For you had better do nothing, than do ill. He adds farther, *There are many Bishops and others, who are worthy Persons; and Preach excellently, and Dissenters oft go to hear them.* This is an ensnaring, but a weak and insufficient Plea. I am far from being an Enemy to wholesome Preaching; it often excites to Goodness, and awakens the Sinner, and hath many advantages. But still there is a great difference between *bearing a Sermon*, and *communicating* in the *Prayers* and at the *Sacrament*: In this our Consent is all along required; in the other we are Judges, and may imitate the *Bereans*, and search and try whether those things be so. Besides, the Oyliness of a Man's Words is no good Reason to be his Followers in Religion; a *Jesuit* may preach as takingly as Mr. *Shore* or Mr. *Burgesse*; and I am afraid some of that equivocating Tribe too often

in disguise hold forth in some *Congregations* of the *Dissenters*; nay, a *Jew*, a *Turk*, or an *Heathen* may discourse as bewitchingly as either *Dissenters* or *Conformists*: Nor have I yet heard of any of them, who durst pretend to outdo *Demosthenes* or *Tully* for the *talking part*. It is not therefore the *Parts*, the *Learning*, or the *Quaintness* of the *Sermonizer*, which can be a sure ground of our following his *Communion*: For those words, which were sweet as Honey in the Mouth, may be bitter as Gall in the Belly; and the smother the *Preacher*, the greater the *danger*, unless the *Communion* be sound. That therefore must be first taken care of; and then I should be glad to hear Truth and Goodness set forth to the best advantage, and most powerfully recommended. But if you give full scope to your itching Ears, without adhering to the *true Communion*, you are in a far more likely way to wander endlessly, than ever to fix upon Truth.

(7.) I pass now from his own Plea, to such Objections as he saith others make against *Occasional Conformity*, and the Answers he gives to them. And first he tells us it is said, that this *shews they are a lukewarm People, neither hot nor cold; that they halt between two Opinions, between God and Baal*, (p. 111.) Here is a double Charge: 1st, Of want of due Zeal for the Cause of Righteousness. 2^{dly}, Of Indifferency, or an inclination equally to false as true Worship. To which he saith first in general, That *there is no good Principle but may be abused*. It may be so; but this Principle is so far from being good, that it is in its own nature an *abuse*, and leads Men to all looseness and unsteadiness of Practice. For how can he be thought to be concern'd for the Truth of Communion, who by turns can be of any? But in particular, as to Lukewarmness it self, he cannot speak much in
its

its praise; and those *who go to the Publick out of profaneness and worldliness*, he saith, *do very ill*. And if they went to a *Dissenter's Meeting*, would it not be the same? Or would you not be rather willing to connive a little in that case? But he becomes the Compurgator of his *Dissenters* from any such Crime: For he tells us, *That they have a Zeal for God, but it is according to knowledge*. But what if we will not take his word for this, but put him upon the proof of it? When Men are accused of *Lukewarmness*, it is not enough to tell us they are Men of *Zeal*, unless you prove it. But our Author is above proving things, it is enough for him to say it; and perhaps it were unreasonable to require more of him. For *Lukewarmness* had been proved against them by several; and it is somewhat an unreasonable talk to put a Man upon proving, that *Lukewarmness* is *Zeal*; and that being *indifferent*, and little concern'd as to the *knowledge of Truth*, is *acting according to knowledge*. The second part of the Charge concerning *balting between God and Baal*, he disproves just after the same manner, by giving us his word for it, *That they do not look on going to the Church, as a going to worship Baal*. Is this indeed true? Why then do you call the Church-Ministers *Baal's Priests*? But they may call us what they will, I may be sorry for their Phrensie, but shall never think the worse of Truth for their ill opinion of it. And to shut up this point, shall deal plainly with them: We never thought that the *Dissenters Worship* was a direct *worshipping of Baal*; but this we say, that *Schismatical Worship* is a *Sinful Worship*, and such as God doth not accept; and then pray who shall lay claim to it? For my part in such case I know not how to excuse it from being doing the *Devil service*. But Mr. Dodwell hath fully handled this Argument, in his late Treatise
against

against *Occasional Conformity*, wherein he hath proved you *Schismaticks*, and then proved *Schismaticks* to be of the *Synagogue of Satan*; and thus he proves from *Scripture*, the proof which you always call for, and profess to stand by; and this coming from a Man of known Piety, Learning and Integrity, who doth it in as soft and gentle terms as the nature of the thing will bear; not with any design to reproach you, but out of pure Tenderness and Compassion to awaken you, and make you seriously and impartially to consider, look into, and examine your State and Condition: If you cannot as fully and clearly answer his Arguments, it ought to terrifie you, and prevail with you to forsake that dangerous course of Life. But after all, I am afraid, that it will rather raise your Choler, than affright you from your Sin.

(8.) The next Objection against the *Dissenters* is what he saith the *High Conformists* bring against them, and for which he seems much displeased with them; and well he might, for it is very weighty: The sum of it is, That *constant Communion is a necessary Duty, where occasional Communion is lawful*, (p. 112.) which rightly understood is a great truth. For seeing I may not join in any *Communion* unless it be *lawful*, what hinders but that I may always join in that *lawful Communion*? But then seeing that *lawful Communion* ought in Substance to be every where the *same*, and all *Communions* set up against such *lawful Communions* are *unlawful*, it unavoidably follows, that *constant Communion* in that *lawful Communion* is a *necessary Duty*. But I forget my self; for my present business is not to prove this, but to examine how well he disproves it: For if he cannot overthrow it, it will stand of it self against him. And the first thing he pleads is *Conscience*,
O That

That if they should do otherwise, *they should sin against God, and the Dictates of their Conscience.* I wish *Conscience* were never made a Pretence, but that we might believe it to be so; for though there should be Error, yet there would be more Sincerity. Conscience is a sort of a Rule, but it is *regula regulata*; to justify the Action, it must be guided by a superior Rule: For it is not a Man's Conscience that makes a thing right, but it is the agreeing with the true Rule, that makes both the Act and the Conscience right: And yet an erroneous Conscience may so entangle a Man, as to make that evil in him, which is not so in it self; for though what he doth should be materially good, yet it would be evil to him, who is persuaded in his mind that it is evil; for he doth it as evil: And it is an argument, that there is a preparation of Mind in that Man, according as Interest or Danger presents, to do evil at any time. Since therefore it can never be safe for a Man to act contrary to the Dictates of his Conscience, I know no other way he hath to get out of this Snare, than to rectifie his Conscience by better informing himself; which may teach us, that in the case of Religion, and the Salvation of our Souls, we ought not to grudge any pains for the discovery of the Truth. But the case is altered, when we come to consider, what effect Conscience hath upon others, and how far the Publick shall take notice of it: For if another Man's erroneous Conscience involve him in Sin, it doth not reach me; for if he be mistaken, I am not bound to mistake with him for company: Nor doth his thinking what I do to be wrong, make it so, if in it self it be right, though it would be otherwise in his own case. But as to the Church or the Publick, the bare Plea of *Conscience* is by no means satisfactory:

Indeed

Indeed where an Erroneous Conscience meets with a Meek and Christian Temper, I think it ought to be treated with all tenderness. For where there is a real disposition to Goodness, Men will be easily reclaimable from Error, when due pains are taken with them. But let a Man's Conscience be what it will, he may keep it to himself, nobody can take it from him: But it alone ought not to be made a Plea for publick Practice. For if you admit that as sufficient, no Society can have any security or command of their Members: Indeed it were the ready way to dissolve all Society. For every *Leveller*, who would be seizing and disposing other Men's Goods, would plead *Conscience*. All those Sins, which flow from Malice, Hatred, or Revenge, in their Justification would cry out *Conscience*. Nay, I question, whether there can be a *Sin* named which would not retain *Conscience* for its *Advocate*, if that would bring it off. But besides all this, though great regard is to be had to *Conscience*, yet when Men make *Conscience* the Plea for their *open Practice*, we cannot tell whether they speak Truth or not. For *Conscience* is to themselves, and we cannot see into them; and therefore when Men plead *Conscience* for *ill Practices*, though it cannot be *plainly proved*, yet it may be *screwedly suspected*, that the Pretence is *hypocritical*. In this case therefore not *Conscience*, but the *Grounds* and *Reasons* which *guide Conscience*, are to be produced; and if they will stand the tryal, your cause will be good; if not, you ought to be cast in your Suit.

(9.) I shall therefore now consider those Reasons on which he seems to found his Plea of *Conscience*; and the first is Mr. *Baxter's* Example and Opinion. Mr. *Baxter* was a Man who made a great shew and bustle in the World; but he carry'd too much *Sail*, and too little *Ballast*:

Nor perhaps can you match him with another Man in his time, that was so unsteady either in *Opinion* or *Practice*; so wavering in *Opinion*, that you may find him both *Arminian* and *Predestinarian* in the same Sheet, (see his *Body of Divinity*;) and as for his *Practice*, it was always suited to the Interest of his Party; if that was *strong*, he was *zealous* against the *Church*; but if their Interest was *weak* and *sinking*, then he *courted* the *Church*, and made his approaches accordingly. Now is this an Example fit to guide all Mankind? Or is it possible for any Society to frame a *settled Government* from such an *unsettled Pattern*? His Opinion in this particular case you tell from what he many Years ago said, That *he would chuse constantly to join with such a Church as he thought most according to Christ's mind, and sometimes with the Episcopal, sometimes with the Congregational, and sometimes with the sober Anabaptists, if they would permit him, (p. 113.)* How can he call his *Communion* in any particular Church *constant*, while he is by turns running through all these several *Communions*, and perhaps through the Number thrice told for the same Reasons? Or are the *Episcopal*, the *Congregational*, and his *sober Anabaptists*, all of them *most according to Christ's mind*? Or are they then singly *most according to Christ's mind*, according as he is disposed to join in their *Communion*? Or seeing he makes the reason of his *Communion* to be, that he thinks the *Church* to be *most according to Christ's mind*, may he at pleasure leave that *Church*, which he thinks to be *most according to Christ's mind*, to communicate in that *Church* which he verily believes to be *not most according to Christ's mind*? What stuff, what giddy-brain'd Doctrine is this! And yet our Author hath the Confidence to tell us, That *this some judge a right and noble Principle,*

ciple, a commendable Practice, and fit to destroy damning Schism. I do not know but it may; but then it will destroy Religion first, by discharging Men from all Sense or Conscience of their ways; so that this would be a Remedy like setting a Man's House on fire to kill the Bugbs.

(10.) His next Reason is more plausible, though of as little force. I can easily grant him, *That we would be loth to do that always, which we might do, and have done sometimes.* I may blow up, or suffer my House to be blown up, when no other way is likely to put a stop to a raging Fire: But I may not blow it up, when I list. But then I would ask you, whether, when you may have *wholsome Meat* enough, you would leave it to gorge your self with *unwholsome*? Or, whether (for these are your Instances) when you may dwell in a *convenient House*, you would leave it to run from one *inconvenient House* to another? If you would stick to your *wholsome Food*, and chuse to dwell in your *convenient House*, why should you not as well stick to your *wholsome Communion*? And thus your own Instances make your *Occasional Conformity* unreasonable, at least when you can enjoy a Communion, which you approve. But you have not stated the Case fairly in saying it to be alledg'd, *That what we may do sometimes, we may and ought to do always.* Certainly never was any Man so mad, as to assert it in this Latitude, or to think, that what may be done sometimes in particular Exigencies, or in civil Affairs, or in some Cases of Religion, may be done always, I may eat and drink sometimes, but I may not make it the whole Business of my Life, and do nothing else but eat and drink; if any Man should do so, whatever else might be his Crime, without doubt he would be short-liv'd. To pray frequently is a Christian Duty, and yet

there were those, who were justly condemn'd for Hereticks, because they thought themselves bound to spend their whole time in Prayer to the neglect of other Christian Duties. The matter therefore, as it is before us, ought to be restrained to Christian Communion, and to the constant and stated parts of it : And then the Question will be, whether that Communion, which is acknowledged to be so lawful, that you can lawfully joyn in it, doth not require you to stick to it, and constantly to joyn in it, as you have Opportunity, and lawful Authority requires ? Now seeing Christian Communion is a necessary Duty, and you acknowledge the Church Communion so lawful, that you can joyn in it, it must follow, that you are obliged to such constant Communion there, unless you can avoid it one of these two ways. 1st, That this Communion, which is lawful at some times, is not so at others ; That that which is sound and wholesome Food sometimes, is rotten and stinking, and unwholesome Food at others. But it will be hard to prove this against it, because it is always the same ; though suppose the best of your Communion, perhaps this might be proved against it ; because it is so variable and uncertain, that even in the very Matter and Substance of it, it may be faulty at one time, though defensible at another. The other way is to prove, that opposite Communions are lawful : But this is not only repugnant to, and inconsistent with that Peace and Union, which is every where recommended and commanded in Holy Scripture ; but was unanimously condemn'd in all the purer Ages of the Church ; and would be an Inlet to, and Justification of eternal Disorders and Confusions. Till you can prove one of these two things, I need give no farther Answer to you. However, I shall tell you, that your other Instances are impertinent.

pertinent. For whereas *St. Paul* circumcised *Timothy*, and refused to circumcise *Titus*, it was according to the approved Usage and Practice of the Church at that time, the Mother of *Timothy* being a *Jewess*, but *Titus* was by both Parents a *Greek*; and the same is the Reason of *St. Paul's* Vow for the quieting of the believing *Jews*. For *St. Paul* was a *Jew*, and the *Jewish* Customs were not then left off, though in Strictness their Obligation had ceased; but for a Gentile Christian to have done so, would have been held utterly unlawful: Besides, all this was done in the Communion of the Church, and by Church Rules, and to prevent *Schism*, not to approve or encourage it.

(11.) This done, he passeth on to another Objection made against them, which if he had dealt ingenuously, he ought to have represented fairly and in its full Strength; but on the contrary, he hath set it down in the most disadvantageous Terms he could. 'Tis said, (saith he p. 114.) *if a Church be many ways corrupt, yet if we think it so right in the main, that it may be communicated with at any time; all in the Nation, wherein it is, are bound to communicate with it always.* Before I proceed to his Answer, I shall remark two things. 1st, That it is a very Unchristian part to presume Corruptions which are not, and to slander and belye a Church, that you may fright Persons from it. For what Corruptions can you find in the Worship? if you durst name them, I doubt not but that they would not only prove justifiable, but appear to be her Glory and Honour. If her hands be somewhat tyed up, as to the Exercise of Discipline, it is what she bewails, and is desirous to recover: And that she cannot do it, is owing to the restless Endeavours of a stubborn, turbulent, seditious sort of Men, whom you and your Brethren by all means animate;

and then where lies the Fault? 2dly, It is to be considered, that we are Men on Earth subject to Infirmities, and when all is done, such is the Industry of the Devil, and the Prevalence of our own depraved Natures, that there will be Tares among the Wheat: If therefore some Corruptions and Abuses be crept into a Church, provided there be no sinful Terms of Communion, it ought not to hinder Communion. For he that will not joyn in Communion, but where the Church is free and clear from all Corruptions and Abuses, he must seek it in Heaven; for he will never find it in this Lower World. I come now to his Answer, and he saith, That *this is a false Principle, and tends to destroy the Church of God; for it tends to hold up Evils in Churches, and to put a bar to all Reformation.* If this were true, the Case were dangerous; but with all the Eyes I have, I cannot discern the Validity of the Consequence, but upon due Consideration do think, that the quite contrary rather follows from this Principle: and I will leave it to any impartial Judge, which of these two Consequences is most natural. Corruptions and Abuses will always be creeping into a Church, therefore *they must be kept in and continued there, or therefore Church Governors ought to be more watchful to discover them, and more careful to turn them out again.* But he is unwilling to trust Church Governors, or indeed any Rulers with Reformation; but is for setting up an Original Right in the People with respect to Religion, as others do with respect to the Civil Power; and thus to serve God as they do his Vicegerents. 'Tis usually (saith he) the Knowledge and Zeal of holy People, who by their Words and Doings, and Sufferings, put the Rulers upon casting Evils out of their Kingdoms and Churches (p. 114.) but lest you should not thoroughly understand his meaning
by

by this, he immediately thus farther explains himself. *Most grant it may be done in another Kingdom; and if so, why not in the same, and why not in this? Whence comes the Difference? That which may be done in other Nations, may be done in the same? Is there not the same Rule and Law for both? The People in Holland and Scotland differ from England in divers lesser things, and use the Presbyterian Government, and are not damn'd for that; and shall they that in England do the same things be damn'd; Is not the Rule of God's Word the same for both? Well, let Presbytery, if he so please, sanctifie Murder, Rebellion, Rapine, and all the barbarous Cruelties and Outrages that can be committed; for if this do not imply the Justification of all these as lawful, I cannot understand a Man's meaning; however, I will not dispute it with him, who is or is not damn'd, but leave it to the righteous Judge of the whole Earth. But this I cannot forbear to say, that I think here is a clear and full Discovery: And that they must be blind, who cannot see, for what this strong Cry of Moderation is made use of and design'd. It is only to cast a Mist before Mens Eyes, while they grow strong enough, and can nick a fit Opportunity to introduce the Presbyterian Government, as was done in Scotland. For seeing it was done in another Kingdom, why not in this? Whence comes the Difference? And when this blessed time comes, you shall have Moderation with a Vengeance; honest Mens Houses shall be broke open, their Goods, rifled and plundered, their Estates seized, their Persons confin'd, or their Brains knockt out, if they have not the good hap to escape by Flight; and it shall be as much as any Man's Life is worth to open his Mouth against Presbytery. And this you shall be told is both according to the Law of God, and the Law of the Land.*

Land. For why may not that be done here, which was done there? *There is the same Rule and Law for both, and the Rule of God's Word the same for both.* If a *Moral Heathen* had seen *these Doings*, and heard *these Pleadings*, would he think the *Christian Laws* came from *Heaven* or *Hell*? Will it not strongly recommend our Religion to those, that are without, when they shall hear the *Laws* of our God pleaded in *Justification* of the most *merciless Barbarities*, and the *deepest Villains* extoll'd as the *greatest Saints*? However, though we had reason to guess at your meaning, yet you did *well* (though your Party may think it not done very *wisely*) to tell it us *plainly*. For now we may be satisfied, that these violent Disputings for *Moderation* are only *Preliminaries*, or like sounding the *Trumpet* before the *Battel*; the *Business* it self is intended for *Legion-work*; *Scolding* may give a *Whet*, but *Fighting* must do the *Feat*. I think we have had enough of this *Author*; and now we know his meaning, may have done with him: But there are some small Matters follow, which though not worth notice, shall not be pass'd by altogether in Silence.

(12.) It is Labour in vain to give Counsel to those Persons, who think none so wise as themselves. It seems some-body had advised the *Dissenters* to attend the publick constantly, and forbear all other ways of *Worship* beyond that of a *Family*, yet faithfully endeavour *Reformation* in the *Worship* and *Discipline* of the Church: But, saith he, they dare not do that. (p. 116.) I know not what they dare do, but this I believe they will not do: For it is not likely to answer their end, this is too *heavy* and *dull* a way, more *Activity* and *Vigour* is necessarily required for the bringing in of *Presbytery*, which is what they mean by *reforming the Worship and Discipline of the Church*. But though I think
our

our *Spiritual Governors* cannot be too careful to watch against *Corruptions* and *Abuses*, and to correct and amend them; yet I think it very dangerous to buzze People in the Head, that they must be always carrying on the Work of Reformation.

*As if Religion were intended
For nothing else, but to be mended.*

For this begets in all an ill Opinion of the present Establishment, nor can it agree with any Establishment; it makes them Judges of the Matter, who are least able; and it sets them on the Work, who have least to do in it. These perpetual Reformers may well be reckoned among that sort of Men, of whom St. Paul gives this Character among others, That they are ever learning, and never able to come to the Knowledge of the Truth (2 Tim. 3. 7.) This is a specious Pretence, creates too good an Opinion in the People of crafty Knaves, and makes them too ready to become their Tools and Instruments of Disturbance, and will never suffer Church or State long to be in quiet; it is, I think, freely confess'd, that the present Design is to reform the Church the Scotch way into a Presbyterian Government; but if that succeed, the Humour will not cease, but the Independent will be reforming upon the Presbyterian, and if he should prevail, the Anabaptist would not fail to attempt to reform him; nor would the Quaker lie still, but would come in for his Share, and endeavour to reform upon them all; and thus they would be always reforming, till they had reformed away the Christian Religion it self. Thus you see that this Advice, take it altogether, is none of the best; but whether it be not bad enough, or whatever else is the matter, he will not take it, but resolves to stick to his Occasional Conformity. And for

for this he will give you a Reason; *it is a special means to prevent Schism.* But How? Why he will tell you that too. *For if Schism lie in separating, and not in joyning with others, then joyning with them sometimes, shews we do not separate from them.* If Fire and Oyl be put together, it is certain they are joyned; but it had been much better, that they had been kept asunder. But I cannot well understand how this differs from being for God and for Baal: Which of the two must I believe, Mr. Tallents, or my Saviour, who tells me, that *No Man can serve two Masters?* (Matt. 6: 24.) The Nature of the thing will not bear it, that the *same Man* should be a *Member* of *opposite Communions*; and if you be a *stated Communicant* in one; you are no better than a *Spy* in the other, or so loose a Fellow, that there's no account to be made of you what you are. But this will be discuss'd more fully hereafter.

(13.) He is not satisfied with the Liberty, that he and his Party may ramble to as many Communions as they please, unless others will be as loose as themselves, and we be effectually jumbled all together; to which end he tells us, *That it's a Duty also for the Conformists to joyn sometimes with the Nonconformists* (p. 117.) Could not he as well have said, it's a Duty for the Conformists sometimes to be *Nonconformists*? For how do they joyn with them, if they are not of them? But let us see how wonderfully he proves this. *The Nonconformists* (saith he) *must needs think so.* If they must, they cannot help it; but with your good Leave, I am misinform'd, if some of the *Nonconformists* be not more sincere, and do not allow of *Occasional Conformity*, and they *do not think so.* But what if they all thought so? Are we bound to think as they do? If we were, then we should be bound to be what they are; and then there might

might be an end of the *Quarrel*, and *Occasional Conformity* too. It is an unparallel'd piece of Confidence, not to suffer us to think for our selves, but to confine us to their Thoughts: And as for the Reasons of their Thinking, they have been answered already.

(14.) It looks more like a Reason, which he urgeth from what some say on our part, that *we ought to communicate always with a Church, which imposes no sinful Terms*; upon which he assumes, That *the Dissenters are true parts of God's universal Church, and impose no sinful terms of Communion*: And thence concludes, *Therefore the Conformists ought to communicate with them*, (p. 118.) Whether they be in or out of the Church, and their Communion sinful or not, shall be try'd in the conclusion. But he ought not to have taken this for granted, till he had better answered what he confesseth some others objected against them, That *Episcopacy is necessary to the Being of a Church, and that there's no Ordination of Ministers, no Ministry, or Sacraments, or true Worship of God without it*, (p. 120.) And if this can be proved against you, (which shall be try'd) it is not your *saving*, and calling Men *ill Names*, nor your drawing, what you think, *odious Consequences* thence, that will serve your turn; your Communion will be *unlawful*, your Condition *uncomfortable*; and the more you *deceive* others, or *fiet* and *fume* in your selves, the more you *increase* your Sin.

(15.) But he is better furnished with *Examples* than *Reasons*; and here he can run you down with a whole Cloud of Witnesses, who are ready to vouch for Occasional Conformity; as if all the irregular Practices that are or have been in spite of all Laws, *Humane* or *Divine*, were to be the Rule of our *Life* and *Actions* for the future: *This* (saith he

he) hath been and is practised by many of several ranks. And so have Murders, Adulteries, Robberies, and many other things which I could name, which are not therefore justifiable, because they were done, and yet perhaps as little repented of as this. But because he is a Man famous for more things than one, and his Example is like to sway much at this time, he fixeth on the particular Instance of the *Bishop of Salisbury* (*Dr. Burnet*) who (as he saith) tells us, That when he was at Geneva or Holland, he was an Occasional Conformist; that he judg'd their Churches were irregularly form'd, and under great defects in their Constitution, yet thought Conformity with them lawful, for their Worship was not corrupted, (p. 119.) If he please to go thither again, and do so still, I do assure you I will not be his hindrance: But let the lawfulness of the Practice be what it will, the Argument doth not well suit with the present case. For his compliance with the Religion established there, is an untoward Reason to plead for forsaking the Establishment here. But however, let this Man be as great as he will, I do not think him weighty enough to be put into the Balance against all the Bishops of the Primitive Church, who were strictly for one Communion, and would never endure opposite Communions, but thought them inconsistent with the very nature of the Christian Religion. But if our Religion be alterable, and the Government of it mutable at pleasure, then what he saith may be good now, and yet in a while it may be otherwise, being excluded by somewhat else, which may be thought better; and so the standing Rule shall be laid aside to dance after every maggotty-pated Fellow's invention.

(16.) He hath not yet done with his Examples and Authors, and cannot forbear discovering his Spleen against the most reverend martyr'd Archbishop

bishop *Laud*; as if he had been the Author of what he calls *these new Opinions*: But *these new Opinions* are as old as *Christianity*; and that I think is old enough for us, without going farther. But he saith, they are *contrary to the Judgment of our Reformers in Edward the Sixth's time, and the concurrent Opinion of our most approved Authors since*, (p. 121.) But since he is pleased to select only two of those Authors, I may suppose he made choice of those he thought most for his purpose; and he cannot reasonably desire I should take notice of more than he doth himself. The first is Mr. *Chillingworth*, who he saith *casts off those Opinions with scorn*. What Opinions are those he so casts off? In that Paragraph, which he refers to in his Margin, there is nothing will bear this Inference, that Mr. *Chillingworth* so much as thought of *Occasional Conformity*. He indeed drives his *Adversary* before him like a *Fury*, and in that very place puts not less than forty Questions, all close one upon the neck of another, most of which would have puzzled his Antagonist to answer. But it is no strange thing to find some Sceptical Notions in Mr. *Chillingworth*; and in that very place are one or two Questions, which shew him to be doubtful in something with respect to Church-Government. But it is a large stretch in you, not only to make his *Doubts* your *Assurance*, but to draw such Inference thence, as he doth not mention, and in all likelihood never entered into his Head. Your other Author is *Stillingsfleet*, as you are pleased to call him, who, you say, *in his Irenicum in several Chapters largely disputes against them*. What those *them* are, you do not tell us; but if you mean *Episcopal Government*, or obligation to *Communion*, I will trouble you at present no farther, than with this short answer: The *Irenicum* was one of the first Books
that

that Learned Person wrote; and considering that in his Youth he was bred in ill times, and laboured under the prejudices of Education, he unhappily began to write too soon. And I have observed, that when Men have once exposed themselves in print, they are hardly brought off from what they have published; and yet this may be said for him, that as he grew *older*, he grew *wiser*, better inform'd himself, and came off from those Sentiments. And if his *Irenicum* did please the *Dissenters*, his *Sermon* long after at *St. Paul's*, when he was a *better Judge*, did as much *disoblige* them, if I may not say *enrage* them.

(17.) I come now to his last effort, wherein he endeavours all he can to make fair Weather. There are, it seems, some Persons who object to him, that *they cannot join with the Dissenters at all, because that is a way to weaken, and tends to destroy the Church by Law established, which they are by all means to uphold; and therefore is not to be practis'd nor allow'd, but to be discourag'd and oppress'd.* And now he is all over Love and Kindness; he is not for weakning, but strengthening the Church: And for these Persons he hath a *great respect, and will strive to give them all satisfaction to his power*, (p. 121.) But when all's done, it is an ill sign to see a *Fox* lick a *Lamb*. He acknowledgeth, that *if it was so, there is great weight in what they say, but herein he conceives they are much mistaken*, (p. 122.) And if he can convince them of this mistake, all will be well, and all good Friends; and therefore it may be richly worth while to try how he doth it. And if you be well prepared with an implicit Faith, and can swallow all he offers without chewing, the business will be done in a full and ample manner: But if you will not allow of this *Papist Principle* at a time of need, but will satisfy your
self

self by examining the Truth or Force of what he saith, you will spoil all again. And first he tells us, *That in their Meetings they do not preach to hold up Faction or a Party, but to promote true Faith and Repentance, &c.* For this we have your word, if we may rely on't. And do you not also preach up Obedience to *Ecclesiastical Laws and Governors*? We do not think you preach *Tom Thumb*, or the *Seven Champions*; Men that will do a great deal of ill, must necessarily do some good, and pretend to a great deal more. But do you not set up *stated Communions* against the *established Communion*? And if this be not to *hold up a Faction or a Party*, I know not what to call it. But he can tell us how this *strengthens the Church*: For saith he, *This Practice of theirs puts some check to corrupt Opinions that are apt to grow up, and to the Wickedness of Places where they live, and stirs up the Publick Ministers to be more diligent and careful in their Work and in their Lives.* This Practice hath been an *inlet* to most corrupt Opinions, *infected* all Places, and made this Nation the *Sink and Receptacle* of the most abominable *Sects and Heresies*, till we are become a *dishonour* to Religion, and the *scorn and sport* of other Nations: And is not this a wondrous check to *corrupt Opinions*? It is true, that Good may accidentally arise from Evil; because if we make any, we ought to make a good use of it: And thus Corruptions may *stir up Ministers to be more diligent and careful*; and I wish it always did so: But must the Corruptions be justified and continued, because that a good hint may be taken from them? I wonder how St. Paul escaped our Author, that he did not bring him in on his side, when he argues thus: *For first of all, when ye come together in the Church, I hear that there be divisions among you, and I partly believe it: For*

there must be also Heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you, (1 Cor. 11. 18, 19.) Those Men had not gone so far as you have done; but do you think St. Paul approved those Divisions or Heresies? Or meant he, that those were the Men approved, who opposed them? We have a common Saying, that *ex malis moribus fiunt bonæ Leges*, that ill Manners are the occasion of making good Laws. Are therefore ill Manners to be encouraged, that good Laws may be made? Or what will your good Laws signifie, if the ill Manners must be defended and continued? If all those Evils, at which good Men are alarm'd, stand upon their Guard, and resolutely oppose, must for their Exercise be perpetuated, there can no Wickedness happen in the World, which at this rate you may not defend. He hath another way of strengthening the Church, by the alteration of some things, which would make it stronger and better. When he tells us what they are, we may be more able to judge whether they would make her stronger or weaker, better or worse, or nothing at all. For all your former Projects have been nothing favourable to her, and therefore we have some reason to be jealous of them. However till we know your Mind, we can say nothing to it. In the mean time I would desire you to agree of it first among your selves: For you are so inconsistent with each other, that hitherto you could never so concert the matter, as to let us certainly know what would satisfy you: And how is it possible to satisfy Men, who cannot agree what they would have?

(18.) Another strengthening Project he hath, which no considerate Man would offer, unless to such whom he thought had lost not only their Understanding but their Senses: *The Dissenters way*

way (saith he, p. 123.) greatly strengthens the Church against the dangerous Enemies that fight against it; against Atheists, Infidels, Hereticks, Scoffers, haters of Godliness, ungodly Men, and in particular against Papists. He might as well have said, that Atheists, Infidels, Hereticks, Scoffers, &c. strengthen the Church. For all these Vermin are the filthy Brood of our Dissenters, or at least mostly owing to them: And doth the multiplying of these strengthen the Church? What inclines loose Wits more to *Atheism*, than to see the various and ridiculous Sects among us? What Argument doth he more flourish with, than from the multiplying all Parties, and their contradictory Opinions, to infer the uncertainty of all Religion? As if because there are so many *false ways*, there could be no *true one*. What affords the Scoffer more *sport*, than the ridiculous Opinions and Practices of many of our *Sectaries*? And indeed so very absurd are some of their Opinions and Practices, that the bare describing or naming them would look like Scoffing. If this be your way of *strengthening the Church*, the Lord deliver us from it. But I mostly admire at your Confidence, that you should say, that the Dissenters strengthen the Church in particular against *Papists*, when their *great*, if not *only hope* is in our Dissentions. Is it not apparent, that to that end and purpose they spare no Pains, and use all Arts to increase and multiply our Divisions? Do you not know, that it can be proved, that in *disguise* they get into your *Conventicles*, and there preach up *dividing Principles*, rail against the *Hierarchy*, and do their utmost to make *irreconcilable Enemies* of the Church? Do they not make their use of these Differences, and from thence draw Arguments to make *Proselytes*? And have they not had a greater Harvest of late than ever? And all this

owing to your Turbulency? Nay, have you not, *mutatis mutandis*, taken many of your Principles from them? For whence else comes your *Leagu- ing, Covenanting, and Engaging?* Whence your *Equivocations, Reservations*, your dispensing with, or absolving your selves from *Oaths*, and all the most sacred Obligations, and the like? If you quarrel in fight, at the fore-door, you may meet and shake hands at the back-door; for you do one another's business. But say you, *The Papists* — *hate none so much as them that are usually call'd Presbyterians*, (p. 124.) Persons perhaps may not be very fond of their own monstrous Issue; but I cannot think them so very much out of love with you. For you are *Tools* in their hands, and they make use of you as *Engines* to batter down the *Episcopal Church*, which stands as a Rock in their Way, and which they hate above all things; not doubting, but that if that were removed, your own endless dividing Humours and Follies would quickly bring you to nothing.

(19.) In conclusion, the good Man cries out strongly against *Wickedness*, and tells us, 'tis that brings *Miseries upon Churches, and destroys them*. A very great Truth! and I should like his Complaint much better, if it were not made apparently with a design to introduce the old sham Cry of *Popery*, and to leave all the *Church Clergy* under the odious Scandal of being *Papishly affected*, and by that means to turn the Hearts of the People against them. For presently he adds, *If we return in our Hearts to the Egypt of Rome, and live in Wickedness, Miseries will come upon us: And this the Nonconformists in their Places endeavour and strive to prevent, as they are able; and 'tis this, 'tis this, which puts them upon what they do, and not their Differences in lesser things*, (p. 125.)

So then these *Differences* are only *Pretences*, small matters which might be easily laid aside; it is not for them you make all this noise and bustle, but that you may stop the *Clergy* in their Career, who are riding Post, whip and spur, to *Popery*. Could any thing be more *malicious*, than under a *pretext* of *Godliness*, to lay so foul and false a Charge to those, who are the only *Bulwark* against *Popery*? If the other *Differences* are so inconsiderable, why do you not drop them, and come to the true Charge? Do not cry *Popery*, but prove it upon them, that the World may see and know, that it is no *false Cry*. *Popery* properly speaking, consists in *Novelties* and *Abuses* introduced peculiar to the *Romanists*, disagreeable to *Scripture*, and unprecedented in the truly *Primitive Church*. It will puzzle you to find any of these either in the *Doctrine* or *Practice* of the *Church of England*. Let your and their *Principles* be compared together, and we shall quickly discover more *Popery* among you, than you can among them. There is nothing you more unanimously and fiercely oppose, than the Divine Right of *Episcopacy*, which is most terrible to the *Pope*, and utterly irreconcilable with his *exorbitant Power*; and nothing affrighted him more, than the Debate of that *Doctrine* in the *Council of Trent*, nor cost him more *Pains* and *Money* than to defeat the *Determination* of it. While this *Doctrine* stands, *Popery* cannot enter; and 'tis this, 'tis this, that you labour with all your Might, and set all hands at work to pull down; in this you fight the *Pope's* Battles, and do him more Service than all his *Missionaries* and *Jesuits*. In this all *Sects* agree and combine, and if they obtain their end, what do they else but make way for *Popery*? For your *Hodge-podge* of Religions will never stand long

before it, and has too strong a Mixture of it already. You cry out with the Psalmist, *The Floods have lifted up their Voice, the Floods have lifted up their Voice, the Floods lift up their Waves.* But certainly you did not well consider, to whom this is applicable at this time, and who may be said to be these *Floods*. For who are they but the *Dissenters*, who like a Tempestuous Sea, rage and threaten to overwhelm all things? They cannot bear it with Patience, that any Man should write or speak in behalf of the Church, but immediately cry out for *Moderation* in others, whilst they behave themselves like *Mad-men* and *Furies*. And truly they have brought it to that pass, that I can see nothing before us but Ruine, unless that God (*Psal. 65. 7.*) *Who stilleth the Noise of the Seas, the Noise of their Waves, and the Tumult of the People,* be pleased in Mercy to prevent it. But how little Reason we have to hope for such Mercy, I wish all Men would seriously consider and lay to heart, that we might become fitter Objects for it. Thus now have I run thorough my Author, and am not sensible, that I have overlook'd any thing in him, that is material, and here I should conclude, but that for the sake of my Reader, I shall undertake one Task more.

C H A P. IX.

Four Questions propounded, §. 1. The first resolved, 2. The second proposed, and some things premised, 3. Schism a continued Sin, 4. Fruitful of many other Sins, 5. An infectious Sin, 6. A rejecting of God's Authority, 7. An irreclaimable and most dangerous Sin, 8. The third Question propounded and resolv'd, 9, 10, 11. The last Question resolv'd, 12, 13, 14, 15. The Conclusion, 16.

(1.) **I** Have hitherto followed my Author thorough thick and thin, who may well be compared to a *Huntsman* in one respect, though not in another: For like a *Huntsman* he leaps *Hedges* and *Ditches*, and seldom keeps any *certain Way*; but then again, he is very unlike a *Huntsman*, for he will not *closely* pursue his *Game*, but wanders from it, like the quondam *Earl* of *B——*, who, if he chanc'd to hear the Noise of *Bells*, would at any time leave his *Sport*, and ride a Quarter of a Mile to see a fine *Team* of *Horses* pass by. This loose, rambling Course, makes me fear, that all, which hath been done hitherto, will rather prove an *Amuzement*, than any *Satisfaction* to the Reader. And therefore to make him some amends, I shall endeavour to bring the Dispute into a narrower Compass, and set it in a clearer Light, which I hope to do, by resolving these four Questions,

1st, What it is we mean, and ought to be understood by the Word *Schism* in the present Controversy.

2^{dly}, Whether such Schism be not as great a Sin as Murder, or Adultery?

3dly, Whether the Dissenters be guilty of that Sin?

4tly, If they be, then whether that Evil can be healed, or the Sin avoided by Occasional Conformity?

(2.) As to the first, when Men quarrel about they know not what, they may make an end they know not when: Thus while our Adversaries shelter themselves under the Ambiguity of the Word *Schism*, the Dispute is prolonged, we speak not the same thing, and come to no certain Issue. It is requisite therefore in the first place, to ascertain the Term. Schisms may be understood either of Divisions in the Church, or Rents from the Church, and are of a lower or higher Nature. The first of these breed ill Blood, cause Disturbances and Uneasiness, and are by no means to be encouraged, but it is not what we mean by *Schism* at this time; and therefore to make the Matter as plain as I well can, I must tell you, that by *Schism*, in the present Case, we do not mean any *Personal Cavils*; even so good and great Men, as *Paul* and *Barnabas*, may fall out so warmly as to *part asunder*; but still they continued to do the *same Work*, upheld the *same Communion*, and acknowledged the *same Authorities*; they were displeased at each other, but did not set up against each other. Nor yet by *Schism* do we now mean some sort of *Siding* or *Factionousness* of People in a Church, as was in the Church of *Corinth*, where some said they were of *Paul*, and others of *Apollon*; for where Men have received particular *Obligations*, they may be allowed to have particular *Kindness*, provided it be not to the *Detriment* of others; and when you have done all you can, you will never so prevail with Men, but that they will have some
Mens

Mens Persons in Admiration above others. *Paul* had planted, *Apollus* had watered, particular Men had received particular Benefits from them, for which they might be particularly thankful, but did ill to fall out about it; but it did not proceed to a *Separation*, they still continued in the *same Communion*, and under the *same Authority*. Such things therefore reach not our Case. Nor yet by *Schism* do I mean barely a *Separation*. For he that forsakes the Church, so as to own no Communion, and never to join in any, though he hath opportunity for it, seems in effect to have renounced his *Religion*, and may more fitly be accounted an *Apostate* than a *Schismatick*. In short therefore, by *Schism* here, I understand such a Separation from the true Communion, as is coupled with joining in a false and opposite Communion; a Transition from the right to a wrong Communion. Now, because there can be no true Communion, but under a lawful and valid Authority; therefore *Schism* seems primarily to consist in rejecting the Authority of the true Canonical Bishop: And those who set up a pretended Authority against him, are *Leaders*; those who join with them, are *Followers*; but both are *Schismatics*. Now, unless we will deny our Senses, this is what we must acknowledge to be the daily Practice, and this is the *Schism* with which we charge the *Dissenters*, That they have set up a false pretended Authority against the true Authority, and forsaken the true to join in a false Communion. I know they will say, That there is no false or merely pretended Authority, and that they are Members of the *Catholic Church*, and therefore cannot be *Schismatics*. But my business here is to describe the present *Schism*, and to set down matter of Fact, what is done and practised amongst us: Let the fault lie where it will, it is plain, that

that there are such opposite Communions; and whether their Allegation be good, must be try'd in the Resolution of the third Question, which that I may hasten to, I shall now set upon and dispatch the second with all convenient Speed.

(3.) *Quest. II. Whether such Schism be not as great a Sin as Murther or Adultery?*

Sol. Every Species of Sin hath such a distinguishing Obliquity appropriated to it self, that Sin of another sort comes not up to it in that particular. And therefore we do not mean, that *Schism* is as great a Sin as *Murther* or *Adultery* in that which is peculiar to those Sins; but that the Nature, Acts, Influence, and Effects of these severally considered and compared with each other, *Schism* may appear in many respects as great a Sin as *Murther* or *Adultery*. Far be it from me to Apologize for either of those Sins, or to make them seem little in the Eyes of any Men: The Penalty plainly declares the Greatness of the Sin. For, with respect to *Murther*, God hath said, *Whoso sheddeth Man's Blood, by Man shall his Blood be shed*, (Gen. 9. 6.) Nor is the Punishment prescribed for *Adultery* less than *Death*, (Levit. 20. 10.) But then if those Sins were so great, that the Punishment assigned for them by God himself was no less than Capital, if *Schism* shall appear to be as great a Sin as either of them, certainly it ought to awaken them, and affright them from either having low Thoughts of it, or thinking they can live securely in it. If it should be objected, That there is no capital Punishment allotted for *Schism*: I answer, That this will not much alter the case. For not to insist on it, that if there be not Law, there are Precedents for it of God's own making: I shall rather observe, that *Schism* is a Sin of a spiritual Nature, and therefore

therefore the most proper Punishment of it is *spiritual*; and I am afraid, that in the end it will be found, that to be cut off from *Israel* is a severer Punishment than *Corporal Death*. Besides, in *Schism* (though the *Schismatick* may not at present be sensible of it) the Sin and the Punishment go together. For no sooner doth he become a *Schismatick*, but he deprives himself of all those means, whereby the Benefits of Christ, and the Grace of God, are conveyed unto him. How far God's extraordinary Mercies may be extended to poor Creatures, deluded in the simplicity of their Souls, I will not concern my self; those are in his power, and at his disposal: But as we cannot surely determine of them, so neither can we with certainty rely on them; we being on our parts ty'd up to the ordinary means, and therefore ought to be careful that we go not out of them. These things premised, I come now to set forth the Heinousness of the Sin of *Schism* in some particulars, and then shall leave it to impartial Judges, whether it may not be accounted as great a Sin as *Murder* or *Adultery*.

(4.) First then you may observe of *Schism*, that it is a continued Sin: *Murder* is rarely committed, *Adultery* too often; but the *Schismatick* is a continual Sinner, it is the business of his whole Life; he is a perpetual Disturber of the Church; a constant Rebel, always denying Obedience to those whom God hath set over him; he sets the Ordinances of God at defiance at all times: To do thus, is bad; but to do it always, is very bad. And can it be accounted a small Sin, which holds a Man always, employs a Man's whole Life, and from which he is never free?

(5.) Secondly, *Schism* is strangely fruitful of many other Sins: It is attended with abundance of ill Companions; and it is observable, that notwithstanding

withstanding their usual Pretences to greater Sanctity, none have acted with greater Violence and Fury than *Schismatics*; insomuch that *one Schism* hath been known to be the cause of many *Murders*, and some are apt to suspect it to have been the occasion of many *Adulteries*. But if it proceed not thus far, there are other Sins which are certainly the effects of it; as despite to God's Ordinances, contempt of Authority, and those which St. Paul reckons among the Works of the Flesh, *Hatred, Variance, Emulation, Wrath, Strife, Seditions, Envyings*. *Murder* and *Adultery* may cause *Hatred* and *Variance*, but *Schism* doth it much more; for those Sins cause it among particular Persons, but *Schism* raiseth it against whole Bodies of Men, and that too against all *Right* and *Reason*; they shew their utmost despite, where they owe duty, and ought to give the truest Testimonies of unfeigned Love and Respect. I know not how Men come to prevail with themselves to make so light of it; for could they make it a small Sin, yet it is a great Breeder, and runs the *Schismatick* on the score so fast, that he will find in the end he hath a dismal Reckoning to pay. For my part, I cannot account any thing small, which doth so great hurt; nor think that less than a Monster of a Sin, which hath so many in the Belly of it. But,

(6.) Thirdly, *Schism* is a spreading infectious Sin. Other Sins are like common Diseases, *Schism* like the Plague: No Man has it, but is desirous to set it on others. If relation be made of a *Murder*, it is so far from tempting others to the like Practice, that it rather strikes them with Horror, and all presently condemn it. If a story be told of *Adultery*, a modest Person will be apt to blush at the mention of it; and if any be so wicked as to make sport of it, yet few are so impudent and hardened

hardned as to approve of it. But if one appear, who, not content with the Order and Establishment *Christ* left, will devise a Religion for himself, oppose his Spiritual Governors, and trade in new-fangled and strange Opinions, too many People shall be ready to hearken to him, and out of an itch after Novelty, though never so pernicious, shall be as forward to take the Infection, as the other is ambitious to give it; and they shall be continually handing it from one to another: And thus *Schism* spreads like a Canker, and multiplies Schismaticks, till like a common Calamity it hath over-run a whole Country, corrupts the Worship of God, disturbs all Order, introduceth lawless and pernicious Practices, and destroys infinite Souls. And if this be a *Peccadillo*, it is near of kin to that of the *Spaniard*. Hence St. Cyprian (*De unitate Eccl.*) gives this Character of a Schismatick; *Ille tumens in peccato suo, & in ipsis sibi delictis placens, à matre filios segregat, oves a Pastore sollicitat, Dei Sacramenta disturbat.*

(7.) Fourthly, *Schism* is an open *Defiance*, and *rejecting of God's Authority*. Every Sin indeed is against God's Authority; but then usually it is not so *professedly*; and commonly it extends only to that act, and to themselves: But *Schism* proclaims open *War* against *Heaven*, and denies *God's Authority*, not only over their own Persons, but others; it is in effect to say with those wicked Citizens in the Gospel, *we will not have this Man to reign over us*, (Luke 19. 14.) For while they reject those whom God hath set over them, they reject God himself: Therefore saith God to *Samuel*, concerning the mutinous Israelites, *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them*, (1 Sam. 8. 7.) And it is not a temporary rejecting his Authority in a particular Act or particular Case, but a constant

stant renouncing and casting off that Order, Disposition and Settlement, which he hath established on Earth, and that in no less a matter than for the Eternal Salvation of Mankind, as if they had a power over him, and could not only abrogate his Laws, but bind him to what Rules and Regiment they please to set up, and oblige him to make good the Conditions they annex to them; or as if they were wiser than God, and could devise better and surer means for the Happiness of Man, than he had done. Now what greater Provocation can be given to the Almighty and Allwise God than this, and this constantly done?

(8:) Fifthly, *Schism* is a most irreconcilable Sin, and consequently a most dangerous Sin. It is very rare that a Man is recovered, who falls into *Schism* or *Heresy*; ten times the pains shall have no effect upon him, which would make another Sinner sensible; and for the most part all pains are lost on them. The Reason is plain; for other Sins appear in an ill Shape, and are in an ill Name, but *Schism* is the Devil transform'd into an Angel of Light. If the Murderer escape the Hand of Justice, yet Blood-guiltiness haunts him like a Goblin, will not suffer him to sleep in quiet, and not seldom the Terror of his Sin brings him to Repentance. *Adultery* is a shameful Sin, and always seeks lurking holes; and whatever Pleasure there may be in the Act, is always accounted a Reproach. He must be a very hardened Adulterer, who being pointed at for his Lewdness, doth not turn away his Face, and flink away out of sight; and there is hope of reclaiming Persons from such Sins, which shame will not suffer them to defend. But the unhappy *Schismarick* is void both of Fear and Shame, he mistakes his Sin for his Duty, and thinks his Crime to be his

his *Glory* : The more *fierce Stickler* he becomes, so much the more *zealous Saint* he judgeth all Men ought to repute him; he doth Mischief in the Fear of the Lord, and disturbs and affronts God's Worship to do him Service; he thinks it Presumption, and no less than Sin or Folly in any Man to reprove him; nor can he hear with patience any Argument against his Opinions; he hath commonly such mean and contemptible Thoughts of others, and is so confident in his own way, that he is deaf to all Persuasions; and so, without a Miracle of God's Mercy, the Devil hath sure hold of him, and his Case is desperate. Now let all these things be well weighed together, and I shall leave the Decision of this Question to the Judgment of the indifferent Reader, and so pass to the other.

(9.) Quest. IH. *Whether the Dissenters be guilty of this Schism?*

Sol. I am very sensible, that to determine this in the affirmative, will be to raise a Nest of *Hornets* about my Ears; but I had rather abide the brunt of their Displeasure, than be an instrument of betraying them to Ruine, by encouraging them in their Sin. Now if they act without Authority, and in opposition to lawful Authority, and depart utterly from that one *true Communion*, wherein the Grace of God and the Benefits of the Gospel are conveyed to us, and his Covenants signed and sealed; then they, the *Dissenters*, are the Parties guilty of this *Schism* : And this I shall endeavour briefly to make good against them. As the Terms of our *Salvation* can be only set down by God, so the Succours and Helps to attain it, and the comfortable Assurance of it, can only be had in the Use of those Means, and under the Ministration of those Powers, which he hath appointed. For if we take upon us to do
these

these things of our selves, it is not to acknowledge God's Power over us, but to set up a Power over him, and to oblige him to stand to, and make good our Will and Pleasure. And therefore seeing God doth these things by the Mediation of Men, in those *Ordinances* and *Ministrations*, wherein we hope to receive Grace and Succours to carry us through our Christian Warfare, to be reconciled to him in Jesus Christ, and to have his Covenants sign'd and confirm'd to us, we must have it from and under those Powers, which he hath authorized to dispense these things. If any Man, though with all the Pomp, all the shew of Devotion, and all the seeming Holiness in the World, shall, without God's Commission, presume validly to execute these Ministrations, he doth no better than counterfeit the *great Soul of Heaven*, which will not only render all his Ministrations *Nullities*, but himself a *Criminal* of the highest nature, as being a *Traytor to God*, and a *Cheat and Impostor towards Men*. If therefore the pretended Ministers among the *Dissenters* act without God's Authority, then they, and all that join with them, are the *Criminals* in this case; if they pretend to such Authority, let us know how they came by it, let them produce their Commission: If they have one, it must be either immediate or mediate; if immediate, then directly from God himself; against which, two things are objected. 1st, That God having established his Worship, and an ordinary standing Ministry to continue to the end of the World, such immediate Commissions seem needless: 2^{dly}, Such immediate Commissions require such extraordinary Proofs and Evidence, as our Dissenters are not able to give, and therefore we shall not further trouble our selves with that Enthusiastick Plea. But if the Commission be mediate,

diate, it must be received from Men, who had, by a due Descent of Authority, Power from God to give it. Those therefore that take it of themselves, and set up on their own accord, are not called of God, and are *no Ministers*. Those, who pretend to an Authority confert'd by others, who had no Power to give it, are *no Ministers*. And those, who perhaps may have received Priests or Deacons Orders, from such as had Power to conferr them, if they continue not in that Subordination, and act in that Station, which the Laws of the Christian Community require, they are *Revolters*, and have forfeited their Right to execute their Power, and cannot dispense the *Gospel Ministrations* with any *Effect*, so as *Benefit* may redound to themselves or others, but rather *Hurt*; which might be abundantly proved, if I were to dwell upon this Subject. Now by one or other of these means, the whole *pretended Ministry* of the *Dissenters* will be cashiered, and all their *Glorious Pretences* prove meer *Mockeries of God*, and *Contempt of his Authority*.

(10.) It were enough to startle them, that they act without Authority, but it is still worse, that they act in Opposition to lawful Authority. And in order to prove this, I shall, with all the Brevity I can, shew with whom Christ left the Authority, to plant and govern his Church, and how to be continued. That *Christ* committed the *Government* of his *Church* to his *Apostles*, and withal, enabled them to leave *Successors* to themselves furnished with all such *Powers* and *Authorities*, as were necessary for the standing *Government* of the *Church* in all Ages, is, I think, so plain in Holy Scripture, that I do not think any Christian will deny it. The *Apostles* as they had extraordinary Qualifications, so had they an extraordinary

Q

nary Authority, in which they were not succeeded; but the Church it self would not be continued without *Successors* to them in that *ordinary Authority*, which was necessary for the *Government* of it. With whom then they left this *Authority*, will be the next Question: And that they delegated this *Authority* to the Persons, distinguished since by the Title of *Bishops*, though Names at first were promiscuously used, is evident from *Scripture* and all *Ecclesiastical History*. *Titus* was left with *Episcopal Power* in *Crete*, a large and then populous Island, and *Timothy* at *Ephesus* the Metropolis of the lesser *Asia*; and as Christianity was planted in other Places, and their Numbers encreased, *Bishops* were placed over them, who according to the extent of their Districts, and the Numerousness of Christians had proportionable Numbers of *Priests* and *Deacons* subordinate to them. *Eusebius* reckons up several *Successions* of such *Bishops* from the *Apostles*, down to his own time, without the least Intimation of any other Form of Government. And before him *Tertullian* (*lib. de prescrip.*) appeals to those *Successions*, as a thing, which the most audacious *Hereticks* could not then deny. And it is as plain, That these *Bishops* were not only Ministers of a *Single Congregation*, but that they had large *Dioceses*, and many *Priests* and *Deacons* acting under their *Authority*, and by their Direction. If a *Bishop* at any time then was no more than a *Presbyter* now, I would gladly know, when and how came the Change. Those Times of Persecution found them other Thoughts and Business than to invent new and unjustifiable Models. Nor would Men impowered by Christ easily depart from such Authority; nor can it be reasonably supposed, that when Christianity flourished

in

in its greatest Purity and Vigour, those Christians should dare to alter the Institution of Christ. Beside, the Government of the Church was a thing visible, and well known not only to the Clergy, but to every *Lay Christian*. And could a Change of such Importance be made all over the *whole Christian World*, and not so much as *one single Christian* ever take notice of it? *Aerius* was the first, who made an Attempt towards *Presbytery*; and without doubt, he would not have failed to alledge such a thing as this, if he could with any plausible Pretence have done it; for if such a thing had been, he had been much better able, than any now can be, to know it; and nothing could have made more for him; and it must have startled the whole Christian World. But he began too soon, and the whole Christian World was a joynt Witness against him; so that Design quickly came to nothing, though in these remote Times there are Men start up, who hope that by straining and confounding of Scripture and History they may bring that to pass, wherein Arch-hereticks formerly failed. Now to apply this to our Case, *Episcopacy* thus settled in the beginning is the same with us at this Day, and is derived to us in a just and true *Succession* from the Apostles Times. For though the *Danes* and *Saxons*, which over-ran this Land were *Heathens*, yet upon their Conversion they had *Bishops* set over them, who were ordained by such as derived their *Authority* in a *lineal Succession* from the *Apostolick Times*: But then the *Britons* were themselves from the beginning; and that Authority hath continued ever since to this Day, though twisted with another in another Line. And therefore the *Episcopal Authority*, and that which is created by it; and acts in Subordination to it, is the *only lawful Ecclesiastical Authority*

rbority here, which can effectually administer *Gospel Dispensations*. For that is it which succeeds from the Apostles, and which they settled over the Christian World, and that by a *Commission* from *Christ*, and consequently by *Divine Authority*. Those therefore who resist this *lawful Authority*, resist the *Ordinance of God*. That the *Dissenters* do resist and oppose this *Authority* is plain, and I think is now proved to be a resisting of *lawful Authority*.

(II.) If this be made good against the *Dissenters*, that they both act *without Authority*, and in *opposition to lawful Authority*, the Consequence will be unavoidable, that their whole Scheme of Worship is a *Humane Invention*, their Performances meer *Will-worship*, and all their Administrations not only *Nullities*, but an *Affront*, or rather a *Rebellion* against *God*. For what else is it, to set up of themselves, and constantly to act in opposition to his Disposition and Appointment? Nor will it afford them any Relief in this Case, if they say, that they worship the same God, and profess the same Faith, that we do. The Observation of *St. Cyprian* is here home to the purpose: Nam & Chore, & Dathan, & Abiron, cum Sacerdote Aaron & Moyse eundem Deum noverant, pari Lege & Religione viventes, unum & verum Deum, qui colendus atque invocandus fuerat, invocabant. Tamen quia loci sui ministerium transgressi contra Aaron Sacerdotem, qui Sacerdotium legitimum dignatione Dei atque ordinatione perceperat, Sacrificandi sibi licentiam vendicaverunt divinitus percussi poenas statim pro illicitis, conatibus penderunt; nec potuerunt rata esse, & proficere Sacrificia, irreligiose & illicite contra ejus, divinæ dispositionis oblata, (*Ep. ad Magnum.*)
i. e.

i. e. Corah, Dathan and Abiram acknowledged the same God as Moses and Aaron, they lived under the same Law, and in the same Religion, they called upon one and the same true God, to whom our Worship and Prayers ought to be directed. But because they transgressed the bounds of their proper Station, and invaded the Priesthood, which by God's favour and appointment Aaron was lawfully possessed of, they were punished by the immediate Hand of Heaven for their unlawful attempts; nor could those Sacrifices be valid or profitable, which were irreligiously and lawlessly offered contrary to God's Ordinance. And yet even these Men had not gone so great a length as our Dissenters. For, as the same Father observes, *Illi Schisma non fecerant, nec foras egressi.* They did not offer to break off from the one Communion, nor destroy the Unity of the Church; only they would be doing somewhat in it, for which they had no Authority; they would set up themselves for Priests, when they were not; and take a Power to themselves, which God had not given them, but had otherwise disposed of it. But our Dissenters not only assume to themselves this Power, but break off from the Unity of the Church, depart from the true Communion, and erect Altar against Altar, magnifie a false, pretended, or unlawfully and invalidly exercised Authority against the true, and steal the Children from the true Mother, gathering and establishing Sacrilegious Communion against that Communion, which hath God's Authority to ratifie it, and what is done in it for the Comfort and Benefit of all good Christians. And thus they compleat Schism: They therefore must be the Persons guilty of this Sin. I should have prosecuted this here more fully, but that I have lately done it somewhat more

particularly in a small Treatise entituled, *The Mask of Moderation*, &c. And therefore, to draw to a Conclusion, I pass from this to the last thing.

(12.) Quest. IV. *Whether this Evil can be healed, or the Sin avoided by Occasional Conformity?*

Sol. I fear this will be so far from affording any relief, that it will make the matter worse. For, *First*, it is contrary to the Nature of Christian Communion, which must be *entire* and the *same*, and makes the Persons *Members* of the same *Body*, and entitles them to the same *Rights* and *Privileges*, which they cannot be out of that *Body*. You can no more be Members of *opposite Communions*, in a Christian sense, than you can be Members of *distinct Bodies*. The *Hand* of *Thomas* is so a Member of the *Body* of *Thomas*, that no *occasional Art* can make it a Member of the *Body* of *John*; or if it could, it must thenceforth cease to be a Member of the *Body* of *Thomas*; they may shake Hands, but that amounts to no more than a Civil Curtesie, it will not be Communion in the *Body*, because it ingrafts them not into those several Bodies, nor derives not thence any vital influence; but still each remains distinct, receiving its Life and Vigour from that *Body*, whereof it is a Member; but if they should kiss, as *Joah* did, with an intent to stab, such seeming Friendship would be the worst of Hatred. What Men have once done upon Principle, I cannot think but that they would willingly do it again, if they had the like opportunity; and therefore I am jealous, when I see some sort of Men put on an unusual Face, endeavouring to make fair Weather: When the Fox preacheth, the *Lamb* is in danger. Any Man

Man may easily see what ill use may be made of *Occasional Conformity*; but I understand not what good it can do. If your *Occasional Conformity* will make you a Member of every one of those Communions, to which you occasionally Conform, strange Contradictions and Impossibilities must thence follow: For then it must put you into all the several Conditions of the Members of those opposite Communions; and so in one you may be a *Member of Christ*, in another a *Limb of the Devil*; one may entitle you to *Heaven*, another to *Hell*. And if this be not absurd enough, why should any thing be said against serving both *God* and *Baal*? But if your *Occasional Conformity* doth not make you a Member of that Body, to whose Communion you conform only occasionally, then you are not entituled to any of the Rights, Privileges or Benefits of that Communion. And what are you then the better for it? Nay, are you not better without it? And were it not a wiser part to stick to a Communion, where you expect benefit, than to spend your time to no purpose, where you expect none? If it should not be *Sin*, it is no better than *Folly*. But since it is against the Nature of Christian Communion, to which every Christian is oblig'd, it must not only be a *Sin* in the *Occasional Conformist*, but a partaking in other Mens Sins by encouraging them to the like Practices.

(13.) *Secondly*, *Occasional Conformity* is either a Mask for Hypocrisie, or proceeds from a Coldness, Indifferency, and Looseness, with respect to Religion. When Men are *Occasional Conformists*, with a design to qualify themselves for Places of Power, Profit and Trust, these very Men, who plead for it, do own it to be Hy-

pocrisie, and stick not to condemn it. But, alas, to what purpose do they *condemn* it, while they *maintain* it! For do they not hereby leave us without any guard against such Hypocrisie? Do they not give full scope and free liberty to the Hypocrite to put his Hypocrisie in practice? Do they not encourage, defend and secure him in it? Certainly that ought not to be allowed, which doth *encourage Hypocrisie*, and *justifie* the *Hypocrite*. But while you allow *Occasional Conformity*, what can hinder a Man in this case from playing the *Hypocrite*? If therefore you do *condemn* him, why do you give him a *Handle*, why do you give him *Authority* to play the *Hypocrite*? Seeing it is in your power, you ought to take that from him. But you will say, there are *Occasional Conformists*, who are not so out of *Hypocrisie*, but do really think it *lawful*. Suppose they do so, is not still the *Hypocrite* safe? But when all is done, how can you tell, that such are not *Hypocrites*? Seeing being firm and steady to a Communion is a greater Argument of Sincerity, how know you with what end and design Men run from one Communion to another? If they do it not to qualifie themselves for a Place, may they not think it a good Qualification to make them capable of one, when Time shall serve, and Opportunity offer? You ought therefore to prohibit it, that you may hinder the one from playing the *Hypocrite*, and clear the other from *Suspicion*. But suppose it to be not done in *Hypocrisie*, can that justify it, if it be Criminal otherways? Unless a Man think any Religion may be good enough, how can he satisfy himself thus to run among all? The Practice of *Religion* requires all our *Sincerity*, and all our *Zeal*. But where is any room
for

for *Sincerity* or *Zeal*, when a Man can wander from one opposite Communion to another, and stick at nothing? Our Salvation it self depends upon the Truth and Validity of our Communion; and can that Man have a sound sense of Religion, or concern for it, who matters not of *what* Communion he is, or by turns of *how many*? The going to one Communion, is the forsaking the other, at least for that time: Seeing therefore so much depends upon our Communion, when a Man judgeth his Communion to be right, he will stick to it, and not wantonly and loosely wander to such as he cannot or ought not to approve. If therefore *Occasional Conformity* should not be *Hypocritical*, yet it is otherwise *faulty*, and argues a defect of true *Zeal*, and the want of a sound sense of, and value for Religion.

(14.) *Thirdly*, Occasional Conformity as proposed is little better than a *Riddle* or a *Cheat*; for though it is highly extoll'd, and strangely recommended, yet they do not give it any certain stated Sense or Meaning, by which we might know how far they judge the Practice warrantable. For if it be lawful occasionally to conform to any Communion, then we may occasionally go to a *Popish Chapel*, a *Jewish Synagogue*, or a *Turkish Mosque*, and at times join in their Communion. But this I am apt to think they themselves will not allow; I cannot believe they have such *large Consciences*. But if bounds must be set to Occasional Conformity, they ought to tell us what those Communions are, to which we may occasionally conform. If they should say, all *Protestant Communions*; this will leave us still in the dark. For there are some Communions, which call themselves *Protestant*, which are utterly

terly irreconcilable with each other, and will not endure Occasional Communion. And if any Man be so much a *Latitudinarian*, that he can communicate with any that pass under that Denomination, truly I should think him to be of so many Religions, that he is sincerely of none at all. And though I like the word *Protestant* well enough, as including a *Protestation* against real *Corruptions* and *Abuses*, whether *Popish* or other; yet there are some *Communion*s, which now shelter themselves under that Name, which I take to be a Scandal to *Religion*, and the *Persons* such whose very Conversations is a defilement. Therefore let them number and name what those *Communion*s are, to which they think it lawful occasionally to conform; and when they have done that, let them tell us what *Communion* is requisite to make a *stated Communicant*, and how far and how often you may go, and yet arise to no more than an *Occasional Conformist*. And when you have done this, we may then know what to say to you; and till you do it, we can neither know your Meaning, nor what you require of us.

(15.) *Fourthly*, Occasional Conformity will destroy all *Order*, *Discipline* and *Government* in the *Church*. And if you pull down the *Walls*, how shall the *House* stand? If you root up the *Fences*, what shall secure the *Vineyard*? The Boar out of the Wood will waste it, and the Wild Beasts of the Field devour it; all they that pass by will pluck off her Grapes; it must lie open to all sorts of Cattel to do what they list in it. Over the *Occasional Conformist* you have no power, he goes and comes when he pleaseth; nor can you call him to an account for any *Misdemeanours* or scandalous *Offences* committed by him.

him. For he acknowledgeth no *Subjection* to you; he doth not think your Censures reach him, and therefore despiseth them; he is a perfect *Liber-tine* in that respect; and notwithstanding any such Censures, will either *come occasionally*, in despite and to vex you, or being distasteth will *altogether abstain*, as the Maggot works. Nor can you tell well what to do with him, where he is a *stated Communicant*. For if you should Censure him for any Disorderliness or notorious Crime, other *opposite Communions* do not allow your *Judicial Acts* to reach them or theirs; and so notwithstanding his fault, he may *occasionally* communicate in as many other Communions as he hath a mind to: And if that doth not please him, seeing he cannot so much as *occasionally communicate*, but where he thinks it *lawful*; what hinders, but that he may *shift his Communion*, and become a *stated Communicant* elsewhere? And then, having withdrawn himself from under their Jurisdiction, may in defiance of their Proceedings come *occasionally* to join in their Communion, who had censured him, and they cannot relieve themselves. For upon these Principles he may choose where he will be a *stated Communicant*, if he think the Communion lawful, and if you had *any power* over him when he was a *stated Communicant*, when he is become only an *occasional Conformist* you have *none*. And thus no Church can have any Power over her Members, which they may not easily evade; which in effect will not only cancel all *Authority* in the Church, and bring in endless *Confusions*, but sets the door wide open to let in all *Vice* and *Wickedness*. For when you have taken away the Power to restrain it, it will not be kept out. Our Saviour tells us, That no
Kingdom,

Kingdom, nay not so much as a *House*, divided against it self can stand. Even the meanest *Family* can have no comfortable Subsistence, nor long continue, without *Order* and *Government*; and can we think it safe, that the *Church*, wherein the Honour of God, the Reputation of Religion, and our own Salvation is concerned, should be stript of all *Power* to preserve her self, and every Man left to do what is right (and perhaps even wrong) in his own Eyes? I pray God these Men may better consider what they do; for if this prevail, it plainly tends to the Subversion of the *Church*, and the Ruine not only of all *Christian Practice*, but all true Sense of Religion.

(16.) I know not what others may think of these Reasonings; nor do I desire they should have any influence on them farther than they are valid in themselves; But I shall cease at this time farther to prosecute *Occasional Conformity*, because I take it to be only an *Occasional Plea*. For those, who now are so eager to set it up, will be the first and forwardest to pull it down again, when they have serv'd their Ends of it. What the same sort of Men do now in *Scotland*, is too well known: They are so far from allowing *Occasional Conformity*, that they think no usage can be too severe against those, whom they are pleased to call *Schismatics*, and make it Death to speak or write against their ill-gotten Establishment. What they did here, when they had overthrown *Church* and *State*, many Persons yet living remember to their sorrow; and when *Sectaries* swarm'd over the Nation, like *Locusts* from the bottomless Pit, though they were their own *Spawn* and *Offspring*, yet they were not willing to spare them,
but

but *rauv'd* and *wrote* against *Schism*, as a thing unfufferable: And indeed had their Cause been good; their Arguments were generally stronger in that matter than they are commonly accustomed to bring; and if they could once again get the *same Power*, can you think they would not be the *same Men*? Or rather, is it not more reasonable to think, that being sensible of their former Miscarriages, and how they came to be lifted out of the Saddle, if they could get in again, they would be more severe than ever, and not trusting to *Arguments*, which failed them, would have recourse to such *Coercions* and *barbarous Treatments*, as should free them from the danger of any Competitors? And what *Bloody Work* would this make? What an *Akeldama* would the Kingdom become? If Men will suffer themselves to be gull'd, they may take what they get for their Folly. But let these Men pretend what they will, *Occasional Conformity* is no other than a *Mask* or *Stalking Horse*, which conceals their Designs, while they pursue their Game; which let them once more take, and they will not stick at the most *Savage Usages*, rather than to suffer such loose Practices; which they know to be inconsistent with the Security of their Power and Interest, and may serve at any time to undermine any Power whatsoever. If therefore we must be twice undone in the same Age, you may expect that the after-game will be worse than the former; that if they drank freely of Blood then, they will make no spare now; and if we were then chastized with *Whips*, we shall now be chastized with *Scorpions*. But the worst of all is, that we draw these Mischiefs on our
Heads

Heads with our own Hands; and seeing no *Mer-*
cies will move us, nor any *Warnings* amend us,
it looks as if God was resolv'd to punish us by
our selves, and threatned by this means to re-
move our Candlestick from us, for our incorrigi-
ble Iniquities.

F I N I S.



**BOOKS Sold by S. SAWBRIDGE, at
the Three Flower-de-luces in Little Bri-
tain, 1706.**

THE Mask of Moderation, pull'd off the foul Face of Occasional Conformity: Being an Answer to a late Poisonous Pamphlet, entituled, Moderation still a Virtue. Wherein the loose Reasoning and shuffling Arguments of that Author are plainly laid open and confuted. Price 1 s.

Concordia Discors; or some Animadversions upon a late Treatise, entituled, An Essay for Catholick Communion, in a Letter to a Friend at Westminster. By a Presbyter of the Church of England. Price 1 s.

A Letter from a Country Justice of the Peace to an Alderman of the City of London, &c. concerning the Bishop of Salisbury's Speech to the House of Lords, upon the Bill against Occasional Conformity. Price 6 d.

The Impudent Babler baffled; or, the falsity of That Assertion, utter'd by Bradshaw in Cromwell's new-erected Slaughterhouse, namely, That Charles I. was no Hereditary, but an Elective King, depending solely on the Vote and Suffrages of the People; Detected and Confuted, by Lawyers, Divines, Historians, Records of Parliament, and Authentick Pedigrees, &c.

Several Discourses: Viz. Of Three Books which teach us the Knowledge of God. Of Justice and Mercy in general. Of Mercy in relieving the Poor. Of Mercy in forgiving Enemies, and of Humility. Of the Original of the World. Of the Original and Pedigree of Man. Of the Chief End and Duty of Man. Of God's Command, and of an universal Repentance. Of the last Judgment. Of the Three different sorts of St. Paul's Auditors. Of the happy State of them that die in the Lord. St. Paul's Confession of Faith. Of David's Triumphant Hymn. All preach'd in Ireland, by the Right Reverend Father in God, William Sheridan, D. D. Lord Bishop of Kilmore and Ardage. Price 5 s.

An Essay upon Government: Wherein the Republican Schemes Riviv'd by Mr. Lock, Dr. Blackal, &c. are fairly Consider'd and Refuted. The Second Edition corrected. Price 1 s.

The

The Ax laid to the Root of the Tree : Or, a Discourse wherein the Anabaptists Mission and Ministry are Examin'd and Disprov'd; their Arguments for it Refuted at large, their Grounds of Separation from the Church of England demonstrated to be Slanders; and the Matter of them most justly retorted upon themselves, as altogether inconsistent with the Notion of a Christian Church, and so creating a constant and indelible Prejudice against Communion with them. Wherein likewise the Unity of the Church, and Evangelical Priesthood are asserted against them and all other Sectaries, of whatsoever Denomination. Price 6d.

The History of Faction, *alias* Hypocrisie, *alias* Moderation, From its first Rise down to its present Toleration in these Kingdoms. Wherein its Original and Increase are set forth, its several Contrivances to subvert the Church and State, apparently detested, and the Steps it has made towards getting into the Supreme Power, from the Reformation to the Rising of the last Parliament, are consider'd. Price 2 s. 6 d.

Old England; Or, the Government of England prov'd to be Monarchical and Hereditary, by the Fundamental Laws of England, and by the Authorities of Lawyers, Historians and Divines; and Allegiance to be due to the King, not only by the Laws Ecclesiastical and Civil, but by the Laws of God and Nature; and that neither the Pope, nor any other Power, upon any Pretence whatsoever, can absolve the Subjects of England from their Oaths and Allegiance to their King. In a Letter to a Reformer. With an Appendix. Price 2 s. 6 d.

